# APPENDIX A- SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| Katharina Achterberg | Support | • The submitter is the Project coordinator for BCRT.<br>• States the proposal is a ground-breaking community lead project.<br>• She holds the view the project will benefit the community.<br>• States the business case is not relevant to the consent assessment process. |
| Airways Corporation of New Zealand | Neutral | • The submitter is responsible for the safe movement of air traffic.<br>• States the wind turbines can obstruct the radar signal path along aircraft routes.<br>• They state the turbines can become a source of clutter to radar arising from the rotation of blades.<br>• The submitter appreciated the extent of consultation early in the process.<br>Seeks:<br>• That an assessment of effects upon telecommunications and navigation infrastructure is carried out.<br>• That the applicant provides details of consultation in accordance with Schedule 4 of the Act.<br>• That, if consent is granted, the following condition be included stating "the consent holder must consult with the Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand (CAA) in order to eliminate the potential for any danger to aircraft (whether direct or indirect) and will obtain an aeronautical study in respect to the application, if recommended to do so by the CAA". |
| Denis Albert | Oppose | • The submitter suggests the proposed activity is Industrial not Community Support and should be considered under a different assessment criteria.<br>• States there is no need for further generation potential as there is already sufficient generation potential.<br>• Disagrees the proposal improves sustainability or resilience for the Blueskin community.<br>• The submitter does not accept the landscape assessment provided in the application.<br>• The submitter dismisses the acoustic assessment provided in the application. |
| Norman Anderson | Support | • The submitter enjoys the visual presence of turbines. |
| Michelle Ashbury | Support | • States the turbines will be able to generate sufficient electricity for Blueskin's community. |
| Neville Auton | Support | • States the scale will have negligible impact on environment.<br>• Proposal will inject cash into economy.<br>• Development could be used as a training tool for tertiary study.<br>• Will support Dunedin growth and help promote the area. |
| Mecaela Baird | Oppose | • Concerned at health effects on residents.<br>• Concerned at bird-strike,<br>• Financial benefit to the community has not been sufficiently defined.<br>• States nearby properties will lose value.<br>• Ground stability is a risk and has not been sufficiently assessed.<br>• Visual impact will be significant. |
| Sean Barnes | Support | • States the proposal will support resilience to Blueskin community.<br>• The submitter considers the AEE is sufficiently thorough.<br>• Visual impact on landscape is positive.<br>• Contribute to lowering greenhouse gases. |
| Andy Barratt | Oppose | • Supports the principles of the Blueskin Community Resilience Trust.<br>• Contends the proposal is not a community support activity and should be assessed under a different activity status.<br>• Holds the view the proposal will create a precedent for other sites or expansion of the subject site.<br>• Concerned with land stability and hydrological risk. |
| Brent Bell | Oppose | • Does not accept development is a community project.<br>• Concerned about bird-strike.<br>• States landscape and views will be adversely affected. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Lights at night will be a nuisance.<br>• Believes that property values will fall dramatically. |
| Magnolia Ben | Oppose | • Proposal will have a major visual impact on the landscape.<br>• Development will result in physical destruction of a prominent landscape.<br>• Does not align with the DCC's 'Dark Skies' strategy.<br>• Concerned with bird-strike.<br>• Will have a major impact on neighbouring properties.<br>• Will create a negative impact on tourism.<br>• The proposal is not a community project, rather commercial.<br>• States current demand for electricity is flat.<br>• States the proposal shows no accountability on how profits will be distributed.<br>• Community consultation has been inadequate.<br>• States the proposal will divide the community. |
| Graeme Bennett | Oppose | • States the visual effects will be significant.<br>• Concerned at lights at night being a nuisance.<br>• Contends the community will get little benefit from the development.<br>• States community consultation has not been sufficient.<br>• Holds the view the developers have minority support in the community. |
| John Bentham | Support | • Admires the vision of the development.<br>• As a resident, he views the visual impact as positive.<br>• Not concerned about noise given the wind makes noise when blowing.<br>• Development has a lot of positive for the community. |
| Sally Blackwell-Jaques | Support | • States the proposal is well researched and scoped.<br>• Commends the community engagement.<br>• Will be a renewable low carbon source of electricity. |
| Jillian Borrie | Oppose | • States the proposal is not a community project, rather commercial.<br>• Turbines will adversely affect amenity/landscape values.<br>• May result in expansion of further turbines once established.<br>• Will result in light pollution.<br>• Concerned with noise and vibration.<br>• Concerned with impact on birds.<br>• States the site is in part within the North Coast Coastal Landscape Preservation Area and the turbines are not appropriate in this setting. |
| Greg Bouwer | Support | • States the impact on local wildlife will be minimal.<br>• Supports community owned sustainable power generation. |
| Grant Boyle | Oppose | • Dissatisfied with the lack of community consultation.<br>• States there is no benefit to the community as electricity goes to the grid.<br>• Is concerned about land stability and groundwater contamination.<br>• Will impact the visual landscape and states the site is inappropriate for the scale of the activity.<br>• Is concerned at bird-strike.<br>• Mr Boyle asks who is responsible for the removal of the structures in the event the project fails. |
| Mark Brown | Oppose | • States there has been a lack of community engagement.<br>• Visual impact will be significant.<br>• States a lot of information provided in the application is unsubstantiated. |
| Sally Brown | Oppose | • States the proposal is not a community project, rather a corporate project.<br>• No business model has been provided.<br>• Community consultation has been absent.<br>• There is no economic benefit to the community.<br>• The Coastal Landscape Preservation Area will be affected significantly.<br>• Landscape report not objective. |
| Colin Campbell-Hunt | Support | • States the proposal will serve as a pilot project for future sustainable projects. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| Marty Cancilla | Support | • Proposal will lower greenhouse emissions<br>• Will improve community resilience |
| Paul Cardno | Support | • States the turbines provide a visual link between the creation and use of energy.<br>• Suggests the structures will remind people to conserve energy.<br>• States the renewable energy production is good for the environment.<br>• Holds the view the proposal is low impact. |
| Thomas Cardy & Jamie Pickford | Oppose | • Both submitters support renewable generation, just elsewhere where there are no dwellings.<br>• The development will affect the community living amenities.<br>• Noise pollution will be a concern.<br>• The application is incomplete regarding noise assessment.<br>• The proposal will result in increased traffic on Pryde Road.<br>• Values of property will diminish.<br>• There will be significant visual pollution on the landscape.<br>• Light pollution will be a nuisance and impact on wildlife.<br>• The site adjoins the Coastal Landscape Preservation Area.<br>• There will be a loss of recreational use on the submitter's property, and Warrington Beach.<br>• Application has a lack of financial detail.<br>• Insufficient information is provided on who will own the asset.<br>• Does not accept the local electricity generation argument promoted in the application.<br>• Proposal will adversely impact on bird-life. |
| Alan & Wendy Chapman | Oppose | • Project will not benefit community.<br>• States feasibility project did not support project.<br>• Community consultation was insufficient. |
| Brittany Chreptyk | Support | • Is satisfied with the AEE provided.<br>• States the proposal will support the area.<br><br>Seeks<br>• That consent be granted without any additional constraints. |
| Thomas Clark | Support | • Suggests the proposal will make the community a leader of renewable energy within NZ. |
| Philip Clarke | Oppose | • The submitter states there is a lack of community benefit in the proposal.<br>• States the business case for the project is absent.<br>• Proposal will significantly alter the landscape.<br>• Concerned about noise emissions.<br>• States the ecological assessment is not sufficiently thorough for a project of this scale. |
| Jeremy Clayton | Oppose | • Concerned at impact on landscape, property values and noise.<br>• Contends the subject site is not the most suitable option. |
| Lyndon & Kirsty Clayton | Oppose | • The submitters are one of the closest residents to the development.<br>• They are not opposed to renewable generation, merely concerned at the extent of the impact on their property.<br>• State the visual effects will profoundly affect their home environment.<br>• State the application is underdone with respect to objective analysis.<br>• Is concerned at the acoustic effects of the turbines on health.<br>• State that vibration effects are a concern.<br>• Glare from the blades will by a nuisance and impact on health.<br>• Bird strike effects have not been sufficiently addressed.<br>• No detail has been provided in the application with respect to effects of radio communication/ wireless receivers.<br>• Geotechnical and hydrological effects have not been sufficiently considered.<br>• Generally state the AEE has been understated and is inadequate for such a significant application.<br>• States the degree of public consultation has been overstated.<br>• The submitter contends the proposal has been considered under an incorrect activity classification and is not community support.<br>• States the proposal will impact on farming activities. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | Seeks:<br>• That consent be declined or if granted, conditions are included in the consent decision that sufficiently address the submitters concerns. |
| Jody Connor | Support | • Supports renewable energy generation. |
| Alison Copeman | Support | • States the application will have a low impact on the environment.<br>• Holds the view the development will have social, environmental and economic benefits to the local community. |
| Rowan Davies | Support | • States the project will benefit the local community with minimal negative effects. |
| Bronwyn Dean | Support | • States the project is 'forward thinking'. |
| Lidy De Leeuw | Oppose | • States the proposal will visually impact on a local landmark.<br>• Concerned with light pollution.<br>• Concerned with bird-strike.<br>• States the local economy will get no benefit from the activity |
| Matthew Dennison | Oppose | • States the proposal will significantly alter the amenity and landscape.<br>• States the proposal has no geotechnical information and may trigger slips risking lives or property.<br>• Comments the proposal will create light pollution. |
| Paul Dennison | Oppose | • States the proposal will be noisy.<br>• Holds the view the proposal is too costly with little economic benefit to the area.<br>• He states there is no real business case.<br>• He asked where the capital is coming from.<br>• Is concerned that land value will fall as a result.<br>• The submitter holds the view it would be cheaper to install solar into each dwelling in Blueskin. |
| Just Doi | Support | • Supports the proposal and states the impact will be low. |
| Gregory Easton | Support | • Supports locally generated renewable energy. |
| Samantha Elder | Support | • The proposal will strengthen the independence of the Blueskin Bay community.<br>• The submitter comments there has been nine years of communication between the application and community.<br>• States the AEE is thorough.<br>• Visual impact will be positive and a symbol of renewable energy.<br>• States that noise levels will be within the NZS standard.<br>• Holds the view the ecological impact will be minor.<br>• The proposal will contribute to reducing greenhouse gases.<br>• The project has high strategic value and consistent with a number of policy documents. |
| Heather Fleming | Oppose | • Proposal will have significant visual impact on landscape.<br>• Negligible benefit to the community.<br>• Business case not clear.<br><br>Seeks:<br>• The submitter wants to know how the community benefits, when that will occur and how. |
| Graeme Fyffe | Oppose | • States the siting of the wind-farm will lower house prices.<br>• Is concerned with visual impact, noise pollution and environmental impact.<br>• States it will have a huge negative impact on Warrington. |
| Shane Gallagher | Support | • Supports renewable energy production. |
| Generation Zero | Support | • Proposal encourages energy resilience.<br>• Proposal will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.<br>• A community initiative that is aligned with local and central government policies. |
| Jay Glubb | Support | • Will create minimal harm to ecology.<br>• Suggests the proposal could help advance other renewable projects in the future. |
| Juergan Gnoth | Support | • States the community will benefit and the visual pollution is negligible. |
| Anake Goodall | Support | • States the proposal represents a low carbon, localised energy facility that will be a beacon project for the wider Otago rohe. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | Seeks<br>• That consent be granted.<br>• That Council adopt the conditions promoted in the application.<br>• Implement an adaptive management approach to those issues not fully understood. |
| Murray Grimwood | Support | • Is concerned about global warming and climate change.<br>• Promotes renewable energy<br>• Is not concerned about noise issues relative to the neighbouring State Highway.<br>• Is not however convinced the subject site is the best given other places are windier. |
| Arthur Grooby | Support | • Project will improve financial independence for Blueskin community.<br>• AEE is thorough and well traversed.<br>• Holds the view that visual impact will be generally positive.<br>• Noise will be less than minor.<br>• Impact of ecology will be less than minor. |
| Basil Harrison | Support | • Acknowledges the project is a community driven action.<br>• States that we should move to 100% renewable generation.<br>• Recognises the community consultation by the applicant.<br>• Endorses the environmental impact assessment in the application. |
| Brett Hayes | Oppose | • Concerned with the effects on local wildlife.<br>• Concerned about noise pollution.<br>• Is concerned about the health implications of the development on himself and locals.<br>• Believes the development will be an aircraft hazard, especially in fog.<br>• States light pollution at night will be a nuisance.<br>• States the proposal does not support the health and wellbeing of the community. |
| Debbie Hayde | Oppose | • The submitter is concerned about the impact on the potable supply of water from the hill slopes.<br>• The submitter's partner is hypersensitive to noise.<br>• She refers to research to negative impact on young children's inner development when residing near wind turbines.<br>• Is concerned at the land value decreasing. |
| Martin Hickley | Support | • Supports renewable generation and low carbon projects.<br>• The submitter believes the project will improve community resilience. |
| Jeffory Higbee | Support | • States the site is a good location for a wind-farm.<br>• Development will strengthen community resilience. |
| Polly Higham | Oppose | • Concerned about noise from turbines.<br>• Concerned about night lighting.<br>• Landscape will be visually impacted.<br>• Suggests potable supply to 12 dwellings from a spring will be degraded.<br>• Does not accept the project is a community project or community support activity.<br>• Property values will fall as a result of development.<br>• Concerned about bird-strike. |
| Marian Hobbs | Oppose | • The submitter is concerned with ground stability.<br>• States there has not been sufficient community engagement.<br>• Concerned with bird-strike.<br>• She questions the quality of the ecological report in application.<br>• States birds may be drawn to lights fitted to structures during rain, fog events.<br>• Is in favour of renewables.<br><br>Seeks:<br>• Improved research on bird-strike issues and geotechnical risk. |
| Karen Hobday | Oppose | • States the bulk is of an industrial scale and not suitable for the receiving environment.<br>• Concerned with sun-strike.<br>• Concerned at night lighting.<br>• Concerned with bird strike. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Concerned about noise generation.<br>• States the proposal will reduce adjacent land values.<br>• Concerned at drinking water quality being affected by the proposal.<br>• Contends there is sufficient electricity generation in area.<br>• States the business case is not robust. |
| Rosemary Hoyt | Oppose | • Concerned the turbines are too close to residential sites.<br>• States the health implications on humans and farm animals are unknown.<br>• States the turbines will affect amenity and views. |
| Gareth Hughes MP | Support | • Visual impact of structures are subjective.<br>• Noise effects will fall below NZS 6808.<br>• AEE sufficiently robust.<br>• Project will reduce demand on thermal generation during peak load.<br>• Community will receive an annual dividend.<br>• Proposal aligns with strategic direction of Council. |
| Gareth Hughes | Oppose | • States the structures are highly visible and detrimental to landscape.<br>• Is concerned about noise effects.<br>• Submitter is concerned about bird-strike.<br>• States that wind generation is yesterday's technology. |
| Initial Volco Trust | Support | • The submitter is a charitable trust managing land on Mt Cargill Road.<br>• They support the campaign to shift to a low carbon future.<br>• The submitter states the turbines will add an important visual element to the landscape.<br>• They state distributed local energy generation is the most efficient model for electricity generation.<br>• They support the community dividend from the project. |
| Denise Ives | Support | • States the proposal will have limited negative impact on the community. |
| Ross Jackson | Oppose | • Concerned at effects on property values.<br>• States the proposal is dividing the community.<br>• Concerned with visual and noise pollution.<br>• States the proposal will affect the landscape.<br>• Contends that Otago and NZ is not short of generation capacity potential. |
| Karen Jacquard | Support | • Proposal will improve the resilience of the community.<br>• The community will enjoy the profits of the project. |
| Andrew Johnstone | Support | • States the application is visionary and aligned with the RMA and DCC Spatial Plan.<br>• States the proposal meets the objectives of the District Plan and RMA.<br>• Believes the development is low impact.<br>• States the community will benefit from the development. |
| Barbara Johnston | Support | • States the proposal will directly benefit the community.<br>• States carbon emissions will be reduced as a result of the proposal.<br>• Visual impact will be minor. |
| Paul Jouanides | Oppose | • Concerned at the lack of public consultation.<br>• States the proposal does not increase resilience.<br>• Structures will affect amenity and landscape assessment not objective.<br>• Is concerned with noise.<br>• Is concerned about project creep and expansion once established.<br>• Believes the development will affect property value.<br>• Concerned with bird strike<br>• Potential aviation hazards with structures.<br>• Neodymium magnets and rare earth element mining is harmful to environment.<br>Seeks:<br>• Clarification on who the key benefactors in the project are and how.<br>• That DCC increase the submission period and proactively |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | advertise the application. |
| Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki Society Inc | Support | • The Rūnaka comment the project is significant at a community and regional level.<br>• The concept of renewables is supported by the kaitiaki concept of guardianship.<br>• Supports the return of a dividend to the community.<br><br>Seeks:<br>• That an accidental discovery protocol be included as a consent condition if approved. |
| John Kaiser | Support | • States the proposal will increase local resilience.<br>• Development is aligned with central government policies. |
| Nathan Keen | Support | • Will reduce reliance on carbon for electricity generation.<br>• Will create positive flow on effects to the community. |
| Elizebeth Kerr | Oppose | • States the effects are more than minor on the landscape.<br>• States people should be conserving energy, not installing new facilities.<br>• Concerned with impacts on wildlife, i.e birds of prey.<br>• States the application is an example of 'greenwash'. |
| Chuck Landis | Oppose | • The submitter is concerned with the visibility, noise, bird strike and reflection from glint off the blades.<br>• While in favour of renewables, the submitter is concerned about proximity to residential properties and the dominance on the landscape. |
| Trudy Lee | Oppose | • Concerned with geotechnical risk and land stability.<br>• States there has not been sufficient community consultation. |
| Samuel Masters | Support | • The submitter states that renewable resources are the best defence against climate change.<br>• States the environmental impact is outweighed by the positive effects. |
| Judy Martin | Support | • States windfarms are sustainable and beautiful.<br>• Holds the view that bird-strike, noise, ill health and visual pollution concerns are overstated |
| Rosemary McBryde | Oppose | • States the proposal has evolved and now does not support resilience.<br>• States the applicant has not presented a clear business case.<br>• Considers the project too ambitious for the scale of the Trust overseeing the project. |
| Stephanie McConnon | Oppose | • The visual effects will be significant.<br>• Lights and glare will be a significantly problem.<br>• Concerned with the secrecy of the Trust in the financial disclosure. |
| Jenny McDonald | Oppose | • Supports renewable energy generation.<br>• States there has been insufficient community consultation.<br>• States the business model has not been clearly defined or explained.<br>• States the site is not the most suitable for wind generation.<br>• Concerned about impact on the ecology. |
| Fatima McKague | Support | • States the project will offer community ownership and provide for accessible and cheaper energy. |
| Lorna McMullan | Oppose | • States the proposal has had insufficient research carried out.<br>• Concerned with vibration.<br>• Concerned with bird-strike.<br>• States the proposal may act as a precedent for other development or expansion at this site.<br>Seeks<br>• Carry out more research on vibration, bird-strike and noise.<br>• Find an alternative site less populated. |
| Sam McMullan | Support | • The submitter supports projects that mitigate climate change. |
| Callum Milburn | Oppose | • Concerned at a loss in property value.<br>• States there will light pollution and glare nuisance.<br>• Concerned with noise pollution.<br>• |
| Alasdair Morrison | Oppose | • Is concerned with the visual effects on the landscape.<br>• Does not accept the consultation has been appropriate.<br>• No detail on community benefit has been provided in the |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | application.<br>• Doubts the financial viability.<br><br>Seeks:<br>• That the application be declined and the ten year lapse period, if granted, is not approved. |
| Joachim Mursa | Oppose | • States the access road is not suitable for such large structures and vehicles.<br>• Is not satisfied with the level of consultation.<br>• States the proposal will adversely affect the ecology of the area. |
| Nicola Mutch | Support | • States the proposal will help the community become independent and resilient. |
| Chris Nelson | Support | • Project will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. |
| Eric Neuman | Oppose | • Concerned about impact on potable water to 12 dwellings sourced from the site.<br>• Concerned about bird-strike.<br>• Proposal is not a community support activity.<br>• Concerned about light pollution.<br>• States the landscape will be affected.<br>• States property values will decrease. |
| New Zealand Transport Agency | Neutral | • Suggests the Porteous Road intersection is not of a standard suitable for the types of vehicles required.<br>• States that traffic will need to be managed given the heavy vehicles required.<br><br>Seeks<br>• The intersection with SH1 is upgraded.<br>• A Traffic Management Plan be prepared and implemented.<br>• The conditions of consent included in the submission are incorporated into any consent certificate should consent be granted. |
| Cecilia Novero | Oppose | • Is concerned with the environmental impact on ecology and avifauna.<br>• Concerned with noise.<br>• Notes the energy will go to the grid rather than locally.<br>• States the ecological and landscape report are understated.<br>• States that turbines can self-combust. |
| August Obermayer | Oppose | • Is concerned with noise pollution<br>• Concerned about light emanating from turbines at night.<br>• States birds will be adversely impacted.<br>• States the applicant has not shown how the community will benefit from the proposal.<br>• States the proposal will affect land values. |
| Peter Olendzki | Oppose | • Is concerned with earthworks and tracking excavations.<br>• States the area is a landscape preservation area.<br>• States the proposal is non-complying rather than community support. |
| Derek Onley | Oppose | • The submitter has broad experience in ornithology.<br>• He is not opposed to wind turbines, but states the proposal will not offset generation by burning fossil fuel.<br>• States the ecological assessment is inadequate. |
| Otago Natural History Trust (by Alyth Grant) | Neutral | • Generally supportive of renewable energy projects.<br>• Has little concern about bird-strike, noting that kaka do fly across the northern side of Blueskin Bay.<br>• Comments that birds may be attracted to lights on the structures.<br>Seeks:<br>More assessment of bird-strike risk. |
| Otago Regional Council | Supports | • States the proposal gives effect to NPS, Operative RPS and Proposed RPS. |
| Rhys Owen | Oppose | • States the turbines will significantly affect the landscape.<br>• The submitter states the project is an in-efficiently sized power scheme.<br>• Believes that overall, the effects will be more than minor. |
| Madelene Ozanne | Oppose | • Concerned with noise, visual effects and the impact on avifauna.<br>• Holds the view the proposal will not benefit the Blueskin Bay |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | community. |
| Rachel Ozanne | Oppose | • States the noise assessment has been insufficiently considered and does not accept the applicant's noise consultant.<br>• Concerned about health implications of noise.<br>• States the impact on the landscape will be major and does not agree with the applicant's landscape architect comments.<br>• States there has been no geological assessment.<br>• Is concerned with impact on the water supplies.<br>• Comments on light pollution relating to Civil Aviation requirements.<br>• States the project is not a community project, and the members are unelected. Comments that consultation has been inadequate.<br>• States the Blueskin Bay community have been denied their wider rights under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act. |
| Jenna Packer | Support | • States the turbines are low impact energy generation infrastructure.<br>• States the development will be modest.<br>• Suggests bird loses will be low, but even if they were understated the impact is far less than other human activities.<br>• Proposal will result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions.<br>• The submitter believes the proposal will support tourism.<br>• Contends the proposal is an inspiring community project. |
| Stephen Packer | Support | • The submitter states the proposal is timely in that climate awareness is becoming more relevant.<br>• Granting the proposal will send a message it is time to act.<br>• States the landscape has been significantly modified by farming practices and the turbines have an elegant beauty.<br>• The submitter states the proposal has a local and sustainable community emphasis. |
| Rachel Palmer | Support | • Accepts the AEE as being thoroughly traversed.<br>• She applauds the initiative approach shown by the Trust.<br>• The proposal will help reduce greenhouse emissions. |
| Anthony Parata | Oppose | • Proposal will adversely affect landscape and amenity without providing any benefit. |
| Nathan Parker | Oppose | • Proposal does not reflect the needs of the community.<br>• The submitter states consultation has been inadequate.<br>• States the business model is unclear.<br>• Concerns with impact on birdlife, especially those migrating species.<br>• States the proposal may impact the aquifers and community water supplies.<br>• States the South Island has abundant generation potential. |
| Alistair Paterson | Oppose | • States the proposal will visually degrade the natural landscape. |
| Rosemary Penwarden | Oppose | • States the proposal will not reduce carbon emissions.<br>• The submitter is for a low carbon economy. |
| Rick Peters | Support | • States the proposal is a positive step to sustainability and less reliance on fossil fuels.<br>• States those who oppose wind-farms tend to have too much spare time on their hands. |
| Hank Rebmann | Support | • The submitter endorses the Trust and their work.<br>• Supports community sustainability.<br>• Contends the risk to birds is low. |
| Richard Reeve | Neutral | • States the receiving environment is significantly modified.<br>• Proposal will not allow pest plant species to invade site unlike other wind projects.<br>• Does not believe the project will affect his property's value.<br>• Has concern about mandatory night lighting affecting the night skies. |
| Sue Roberts-Blyth | Support | • Proposal will help future-proof the Blueskin community. |
| Dylan Robertson | Support | • States the proposal will improve supply surety.<br>• States the development will bring a non-profit group to the locality.<br>• States proposal is aligned with local and central policies. |
| Suzanne Robins | Oppose | • Concerned about impact on avifauna.<br>• States public consultation has not been sufficient. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Unsure how electricity to the grid can be a community project and increase resilience.<br>• States the landscape and ecological reports are not sufficiently robust. |
| Jen Rodgers | Support | • Proposal will increase resilience.<br>• Proposal will reduce load on carbon dependence during peak load periods.<br>• States that the environmental effects are sufficiently assessed. |
| Hilary Rowley | Support | • The submitter believes bird-strike will not be a problem to the ecology of the area.<br>• Agrees with the landscape report |
| Simon Ryan & Jennifer Ashby | Oppose | • The submitters live on an adjacent property to the north.<br>• The submitters support renewable energy generation.<br>• State the proposal will adversely affect the landscape.<br>• They state the structures will be overbearing from an amenity perspective.<br>• States the site is within the North Coast Coastal Landscape Preservation Area.<br>• Does not agree with the assessment of the applicant's landscape architect.<br>• Comments that no information about how the connection to the grid via OtagoNet Limited.<br>• Concerned about noise affected lifestyle and health.<br>• Is concerned with the impact of vibration.<br>• States glint and shadow flicker will be a nuisance and affect health.<br>• The submitters do accept the assessment of the ecologist with respect to the bird-strike conclusions.<br>• States that the turbines will affect wireless radio communication.<br>• Is concerned with the effects arising during construction.<br>• The submitters state the risk of geotechnical or hydrological impacts are significant and the application does not adequately address the issues.<br>• They are concerned with risk to drinking water supply.<br>• The submitters do not accept the request to extend the lapse date as appropriate.<br>• They state the activity category is incorrect as the application should not be a community support activity.<br>• They state the references to the community benefit are overstated.<br>• The submitters do not accept the depth of community support referred to in the application.<br>Seeks:<br>• That the consent be declined or if granted the consent decision include conditions to sufficiently address the concerns raised in the submission. |
| Friederick Schmaltz | Oppose | • States the proposal is too close to settlements.<br>• States the effects outweigh the community benefit.<br>• Objects to the visual effects of windfarms.<br>• Concerned with noise.<br>• Concerned about impact on birdlife. |
| Geoff Scurr Contracting | Neutral | • States the degree of consultation has been helpful in understanding the project.<br>• States the visual impact on the quarry will be minor.<br>• Has no concern about noise.<br>• The submitter states the loss of productive land arising from the project is not significant.<br>• States they are concerned about tourists using Pryde Road to view the turbines and the interaction with heavy vehicles.<br>• The submitter is concerned about impact on a covenanted block of vegetation and birds occupying that area.<br>Seeks:<br>• Appropriate conditions of consent be included to address increased tourism on Pryde Road, such as a Traffic Management Plan. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | • A sign is installed on SH1 advising traffic of wind turbines becoming visible. |
| Anna Seifert | Support | Seeks:<br>That consent be granted. |
| Isabel Smith | Support | • Would like renewables to be a greater percentage of electricity generation. |
| Paul Smith | Support | • Small scale renewable energy projects are a positive step to a low carbon economy.<br>• Impressed with public consultation. |
| Worik Stanton | Support | • States the site is heavily modified and the proposal will fit into the environment. |
| Janet Stephenson | Support | • States the proposal is a result of lengthy consultation with community.<br>• Scale of project is suitable to location.<br>• Visual impact on landscape will be positive.<br>• States providing renewable energy is aligned with local and central policies. |
| Andrew Stewart | Oppose | • Concerned with the impact on bird-strike.<br>• States the proposal will have a significant effect on the landscape.<br>• Expresses frustration at the lack of consultation.<br>• The submitter states there is no need for additional generation. |
| Benedict Stewart | Oppose | • Concerned with adverse effects on birdlife.<br>• The proposal will impact on the landscape and natural beauty.<br>• States the lighting will decrease the visibility of the night sky.<br>• States the farmland is geologically unstable. |
| Cathrin Stewart | Oppose | • Proposal will have a major visual impact on the landscape.<br>• Development will result in physical destruction of a prominent landscape.<br>• Does not align with the DCC's 'Dark Skies' strategy.<br>• Concerned with bird-strike.<br>• Will have a major impact on neighbouring properties.<br>• Will create a negative impact on tourism.<br>• The proposal is not a community project.<br>• States current demand for electricity is flat and therefore the project is unnecessary.<br>• States the proposal shows no accountability on how profits will be distributed.<br>• Community consultation has been inadequate.<br>• States the proposal will divide the community. |
| Mick Strack | Support | • The submitter supports the proposal and acknowledges the 'forward thinking' approach helping communities to act locally. |
| Diana Struthers | Oppose | • States the receiving environment is of outstanding unspoilt beauty. The proposal will in the submitter's view negatively affect the landscape.<br>• Concerned about the impact on birdlife.<br>• Comments that the lights on the turbines will affect the 'dark skies'.<br>• States the level of consultation has been inadequate.<br>• States the proposal is not a community resource and does not reflect or represent the community. |
| Nathan Surendran | Support | • Holds the view the proposal will make Blueskin more resilient.<br>• The proposal is aligned with the policies of the RPS.<br>• States the proposal is thoughtfully conceived.<br>• States the proposal will help the transition from fossil fuel dependency. |
| Geraldine Tait | Oppose | • States the turbines will be highly visible.<br>• Holds the view a comparison against antennae on other nearby summits is incomparable due to bulk.<br>• Comments on the CLPA subzoning and that the turbines will be highly visible from the coastal area.<br>• States the lack of affected party approvals provided in the application is significant.<br>• States from an ethical or economic perspective, the proposal is poorly thought through.<br>• States the AEE is either completely inadequate or non-existent. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| | | • States the AEE includes no geotechnical assessment.<br>• Is concerned at the impact to potable water supply.<br>• The proposal contains insufficient noise modelling.<br>• The submitter does not accept the 10 year lapse period sought.<br>• The submitter discusses her background involvement with the proposal earlier in the project.<br>• States the proposal is not community support.<br>• States the applicant has failed to follow the best practice principles to inform consult and involve the community.<br>• States the applicant does not act for the community. |
| Thomas & Linda Thompson | Oppose | • Is concerned with visual pollution.<br>• Worried about low frequency noise affecting some people's health and well-being.<br>• States the ground at Porteous Hill is unstable and not sufficiently assessed.<br>• Holds the view the proposal will affect the adjacent Coastal Landscape Preservation Area. |
| Jean Tilleyshort | Support | • Scale will have a negligible effect on landscape.<br>• Proposal will inject cash into local economy.<br>• Development will improve awareness.<br>• Proposal is positive for Blueskin community. |
| Larry Timpany on behalf of Blueskin Project Ltd | Oppose | • States the zoning is inappropriate and designed to avoid large development such as that proposed.<br>• States the visual effects will be major.<br>• Glare from moving blades will be a nuisance for long distances.<br>• Lighting to warn aircraft will be a nuisance.<br>• The submitter states the turbines will be visually ugly.<br>• The impact on birdlife is wide-ranging and not sufficiently traversed in the application.<br>• No funding or business case has been detailed.<br>• The consultation process has been non-existent. |
| Theresa Trotter | Support | • The project is a community project supporting climate change. |
| Metiria Turei | Support | • States the proposal is based on a community responsibility.<br>• Proposal will reduce dependency on fossil fuels.<br>• States visual impact will be low and is subjective.<br>• Suggests noise will not be a problem.<br>• Proposal is aligned with district and regional policies. |
| Waitati School (submitted by Anthony Deaker) | Support | • They comment that Waitati School is a committed Enviro-school.<br>• Support clean energy generation.<br>• Well consulted with the community.<br>• Will help with education of children on environmental issues. |
| Waitati School Board of Trustees | Support | • They comment that Waitati School is a committed Enviro-school.<br>• The Board believes the turbines will become a source of pride.<br>• Support clean energy generation.<br>• Well consulted with the community.<br>• Will help with education of children on environmental issues. |
| Mark Waldon | Oppose | • States there has been insufficient consultation.<br>• The landscape will be adversely affected.<br>• Notes the amount of generation relative to the impact on the landscape is small.<br>• Concerned about noise.<br>• Concerned about bird-strike. |
| Pat Wall | Support | • Supports renewable energy generation.<br>• Project will create a blueprint for other communities.<br>• City and communities will benefit.<br>• Objectors are at times irrational in their argument. |
| Craig Werner | Oppose | • Is concerned with adverse impact on the landscape.<br>• States the project will have low longevity due to technology changes.<br>• Concerned about impact on the environment. |
| Alfie West | Support | • Supports renewable energy generation.<br>• States the proposal will provide benefit to the community. |
| Raewynne Williams | Oppose | • Proposal will visually pollute the landscape. |

| Name of Submitter | Support / Oppose | Summary of Submission |
|---|---|---|
| Lucy Wing | Oppose | • States effects on bird life must be fully known before obtaining resource consent.<br>• States the impact on bird-strike is unknown and the information of what birds are likely to be affected has not been considered.<br>• The assessment of impact on ecology is under-done.<br>• The subject site is a potential wildlife corridor.<br>• Does not accept the mitigation measures are sufficient.<br>• States the ecological assessment is not objective.<br>• Holds the view that the Blueskin Resilient Community Trust does not speak for the community.<br>• States the community does not understand the application and consultation has not been sufficient.<br>• States the proposal does not detail any business plan or benefit to the community.<br>• Is unsure of whether the activity status is warranted to be considered a community support activity. |
| Ben Wooliscroft | Support | • Is opposed to large industrial wind-farm projects, but supports small scale community.<br>• The submitter holds the view the proposal will be sympathetic to the environment.<br>• States distributed energy generation is important and will help improve resiliency. |
| Nicola Young | Support | • The submitter believes the development will empower community.<br>• States the proposal will reduce carbon reliance. |

## LATE SUBMISSIONS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Murray Cumming (Received on 3 Dec) | Oppose | • States the proposal will adversely affect the landscape. Contends the landscape assessment in the application was not objective.<br>• States the impact of lighting has not been thoroughly considered.<br>• Suggests the impact on water supplies of adjoining properties may be contaminated.<br>• States the proposal does not consider geotechnical information sufficiently. |
| Alan Greenall (Received on 3 Dec) | Oppose | • States the application has insufficient information.<br>• States the proposal is not a community project.<br>• Is concerned with bird strike risk. |
| Eve Jolly (Received on 3 Dec) | Support | • States the proposal is aligned with the policy statements of the DCC, ORC and National policy statement for Renewable Energy Generation 2011. |
| New Zealand Windfarm Energy Association (Received on 4 Dec) | Support | • States the proposal will contribute to the local and national well-being.<br>• Proposal will create employment.<br>• States the proposal will have minimal impact on the environment.<br>• States the proposal will help mitigate climate change impact.<br>• Has the view the site is appropriate for a wind-farm.<br>Seeks:<br>• That consent be granted with similar noise conditions as that of the Mill Creek Windfarm decision which guided NZS68-8:2010 being the standard for measuring noise from wind turbines. |
| John Thom (Received on 4 Dec) | Oppose | • Is an adjoining landowner and is concerned with noise, visual effects and light pollution.<br>• States the proposal does not contain sufficient geotechnical information.<br>• States the proposal does not sufficiently consider impacts on bird-life.<br>• Is concerned at the risk to impact on drinking water supplies. |