

I wish to first of all address Port Otago Ltd activities to give an historical overview from a residents perspective, then I would like to address the present application.

My name is Naomi Wilson and I live at the only house left on Aurora Tce sited next to Ralph Hotere's Garden. I have lived here for a few months shy of 30 years and in the village for 42 years. As a result I feel intimately connected with my surroundings, and have a good understanding of the major impacts Port Otago has had on the land and the community.

The result of Port Otago Ltd expansion into Port Chalmers already results in significant negative impacts for residents including:

a phenomenal rise in traffic volume through the town.;

Huge modification to our landscape;

loss of night sky;

the demolition of a significant number of houses;

the incremental escalation in types and volume of noise;

While I understand the necessity of a well functioning and economically viable business for the Port company, the community bears most of the environmental downside and it is my position that Port Otago Ltd is not at all interested in the welfare of our community.

The purpose of this proposal is for Port Otago Ltd to accommodate 8100 TEU vessels . This plan smacks of a "field of dreams" scenario, and supposedly will take 15 to 20 years to be realized. There is no doubt that the proposal will extend the misery of noise and glare into Careys Bay.

I see the proposed fisherman's wharf as a sop to the public (except of course when it will be closed for undefined reasons) rather than a future nefarious extension plan. Many residents have fond memories of fishing that once existed at the wharf. This wonderful pleasure activity is no longer experienced by children and many locals consider it pointless to fish in the Port area today.

The bogey of losing business to the point of being uneconomic has been played a number of times by Port Otago Ltd and the Otago Regional Council. I do not believe that the future of Port activities is reliant on this consent.

If Port Otago had to manage the wharf area as is, they would be creative enough to organize the tourists from the current extension from the multi purpose wharf quite safely. To me, this plan reeks of the gung-ho attitude taken by Port Otago in the Past. The destruction of Observation Point is a clear example of their inability to

foresee and mitigate problems. This was their last major project and was applied for before the Resource Management Act came into force. The Town and Country Planning Act made the acquisition of properties much more favourable under the Public Works Act. There were many reports produced, the proceedings seemed to go on forever, with the result being that Port Otago Ltd was granted consent to demolish Observation Point to a nicely rounded profile as per consent.

This work began in February 1994 and was largely completed in terms of their consent in November 1994. A month or so later Port Otago discovered that the original blasting had opened up huge cracks up to a metre or two into the rock face, so in March 1995 they started blasting again. Please see attachment - a letter from Port Otago dated, 8 March 1995.

In 1999 a huge slip came off the northeast face and immediate stabilization action began. This necessitated the demolition of yet another house on Observation Point and a retrospective Resource Consent was granted.

To my knowledge Beach St. remains the responsibility of Port Otago Ltd., as further slips occur on a regular basis.

It is reasonable to assume that if they cannot succeed in excavation above ground that they will make a complete mess of any attempt to blast land under the water. It concerns me that the disaster of Observation point will be repeated. Mitigation is not possible. Monitoring will only inform of problems not prevent them. In addition, Port Otago is extremely unlikely to pick up the pieces if things turn to custard.

Noise mitigation is the prime example of continuing breach of existing rules and of their inability to resolve issues. The current noise regime is farcical. There should be no exemption to the New Zealand Noise Standards. This is a planning anomaly. If Port Otago is to expand, it must do so within a context of enforceable noise controls. The District Plan and the Coastal Plan must be melded to achieve this result.

I often phone the gatehouse after being woken by horrendous noise. I ask the watchman who answers to log my complaint. If the watchman is working in town he asks me to phone the next day. It is a fair expectation that a complaint will at least be logged. You may be able to understand the anger and helplessness I experience at some of the off-putting responses I also receive. I dread the level of noise if dredging and/or blasting occurs over 24 hours, 7 days a week. I also dread the expectation that I will continue to have unpleasant experiences, in having to complain to the employees who are only following instruction.

Fortunately, Port Otago Ltd has dropped the rule that you describe the noise that you are concerned about. Apparently these complaints appear at the Port Noise Liaison Environment Committee but there is little discernible result. I am sick of

having to wear earplugs, 3 nights or more per week, to sleep. I do not look forward to this being further aggravated by the granting of this consent.

At Back Beach, the straddle carriers have suffered no apparent modification to engine noise. Shrill sirens sound, whenever they are in motion. No attention has been paid to brake squeal. The straddle cranes in the basin have hush kits installed I understand. There are so many ways that Port Otago can mitigate the noise that currently exists. They fail to comply currently. They must ensure that they mitigate current and future noise if this consent is granted. This requires commitment from Port Otago to spend a good chunk of their profit on noise mitigation.

A typical scenario is being woken at 6.00a.m. Monday morning by a log grabber unloading a truck, massive thumps as the logs hit the ground, big engine noises. I have understood, since the court decision in April 2004 that work was not to take place between the hours of 11.00 pm and 7.00 a.m. at Back Beach and Boiler Point. Port Otago shows scant regard for rules, when they find them inconvenient.

The Company has finally managed to install shades to the lighting on the edge of the sheds at Back Beach, so they are compliant with DCC rules. It took a lot of persuasion and several years. It drives me nuts that I should have to continually complain. This is not how I wish to live.

That's some history. Now to the current application.

Surely the days of using the ocean as a dumping ground are over. The rather arbitrarily chosen site, AO, 6 kms off the heads will change the entire eco system for miles up and down the coast. I have attached a photo of 120 thousand tonne of material from the Christchurch catastrophe and I cannot see the edges. 7.2 million tonnes of spoil, is unimaginable.

There are far too many gaps in the AEE about the effects of such dumping on all living creatures.

No evidence or justification has been presented which supports the dumping of spoil types, (silt, clay, gravel and rock) at the proposed sites.

Little data has been collected to explain the build up and dispersal of various types of sediment

No study into the effects of spoil and sediments in Blueskin Bay

No study of the effects of contaminants into the food chain.

There is an abysmal lack of information on the potential effects on sea birds and marine animals. The loss of fishing grounds is likely. There is a lack of recognition that the dispersal of fine sediment is a killer on a grand scale. Kaimoana is taonga.

The largest cockle beds in the southern hemisphere located at the heads and within the harbour could be destroyed. There is no mitigation possible, given the monitoring regime that Port Otago favours.

I am entirely supportive of the NZ Marine Scientists submissions and evidence and ask the commissioners to rely on their expertise as I do.

In summary, I request that you do not grant consent without ensuring that Port Otago behaves as a Decent Corporate Citizen:

- Dredging 24/7 days a week is unreasonable;
- Existing rules and standards must be adhered to and enforceable;
- An alternative disposal means for spoil must be found;
- Our kaimoana and coast line must be protected;
- Proper research and evidence must be presented;
- Assured ongoing and permanent budget to mitigation is required;
- Due diligence and proper process should be followed

For these reasons you must at this time decline this consent.



ACA/JMW

95/204

8 March 1995

TO THE HOUSEHOLDER

Dear Householder,

FLAGSTAFF HILL EXCAVATION NEWSLETTER NO. 11

You will have no doubt noticed the delay in the construction of the new road around Observation Point.

The reason has been a concern about a short, sixty metre long, rocky section of the excavated face below the elevated walkway at its highest point. The previous blasting operations in this area have cracked the rock extensively up to a metre or two into the face. The excavation has produced an uneven face with some steepened sections and in some places a rock overhang. Weathering and the ground relaxation following the removal of the overburden have extended the cracking. There is therefore the possibility of small isolated rock falls which could be a danger to passing pedestrians and motorists. Port Otago Ltd wishes to stress that there is no concern about the overall stability of the face.

Port Otago Ltd has taken expert advice on the matter from an experienced Engineering Geologist and as a result has decided to remove the loosened and cracked rock down to a stable base. Unfortunately the only efficient and satisfactory means of achieving this is drilling and blasting using what is known as a "pre split" technique. A series of closely spaced holes will be drilled from the elevated walkway down the proposed new face. The holes will only be lightly charged and when fired will result in a clean split between drill holes with the loose and fractured rock displaced out from and down the new undamaged face. In this way between one to two metres of rock will be removed from the face but not beyond the conceptual plan approved by the Tribunal.

The use of light charges means ground movements will be slight so that building damage is unlikely. Port Otago Ltd will however monitor ground movements as before using a seismograph. It is not intended to repeat the recently completed property damage inspections after the blasting unless we are specifically requested to do so.

Depending on weather conditions and because of the light cover of rock over the drill holes the blasts may produce an audible crack and an airshock wave.

Drilling will begin on Thursday 9 March and is expected to last two and a half weeks. There will be one or two trial blasts of around ten holes each and a main blast of around forty holes. The arrangements will be the same as before with the blasts timed for 4.00 pm and a red flag flown at the Port Otago Ltd gatehouse on the day of a blast.

Port Otago Ltd realises that for some the news of further blasting will be distressing. The delay in our response to the situation was due in part to our unsuccessful efforts in trying to find an alternative non-blasting solution. In this we have been unsuccessful but we have been able to keep the programme confined to two and a half weeks in order to minimise impacts.

Yours sincerely

A C Arnesen
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEER

