



Dear Sir/Madam,

Section 92 Request for Further Information on Resource Consent Application 202.2022.136.1

The Tararua District Council has received the following resource consent application for consideration:

Application Number: 202.2022.136.1

Applicant: Energy Bay Limited.

Site: 129 Tutaekara Road and 410 Mangamaire Road Pahiatua.

Proposal: The applicant is seeking the necessary resource consents to establish and operate a solar farm. The solar farm is proposed to occupy approximately 87 hectares of land over two sites located at 129 Tutaekara Road and 410 Mangamaire Road.

The proposal will include the construction of 88,500 solar panels arranged on solar tables, which will be about 60 metres long and 4.9 metres wide. The panels rotate to follow the sun, reaching a maximum height of 4.55 metres above ground. Eleven inverters will convert the DC current from the solar panels to AC current suitable for delivery to the nearby PowerCo substation.

Approximately 20,700m³ of earthworks will be required across the site for access tracks, cable trenching and a small volume of site contouring.

The applicant proposes to maintain pastoral grass beneath the panels and continue to graze sheep or calves on the site.

The application includes an assessment of effects on the environment and supporting technical assessments relating to landscape effects, glint and glare, and noise.

Thanks for the application you have lodged on behalf of Energy Bay Ltd for a solar farm at Mangamaire. As discussed with you last week, Tararua District Council have requested that I process the consent on its behalf. I have now reviewed the application and supporting information

and Shannon Bray (Wayfinder) has reviewed the landscape report. I am waiting for confirmation from acoustic consultants to review the noise report (TDC usually uses Marshall Day). We are not expecting any significant noise issues but given that this application will be notified we want to ensure that the methodology used, and conclusions drawn are robust. If any further information is required in respect of noise, I will request that as soon as I can.

In reviewing the application and visiting the site, I have noted the following and request further information as outlined below:

1. There appear to be some discrepancies related to the affected persons approvals. Firstly, Table 5 of the application outlines the written approvals that have been received. It is noted in this table that an approval from Ryan and Jess McNicol (346 Mangamaire Road) has been received. This has not been included with the application. The landscape report states that written approval has been received from the property owners and has not assessed effects on them or their property. It is further noted that the landscape report states that eight properties are identified as being impacted by the proposal and that six of the eight owners have provided written approval. It also indicates that approval has been received from the property owners at 500 and 562 Mangamaire Road; however, these have not been provided with the application, and consequently no assessment has been carried out in respect of these properties.
 - a. If you have received written approvals in respect of the application for the properties at 346, 500 and 562 Mangamaire Road, or any other properties, can you please provide them.
 - b. If no approvals for these properties exist, can you please carry out an assessment of effects on those properties and the owners/occupiers.
2. There are some properties that are located immediately adjacent or close to the subject site where no assessment has been carried out. It is noted that the landscape report identified eight properties as potentially impacted but does not explain why the other nearby properties are not impacted. Not all of these properties have street addresses, but I have included legal descriptions in the table below to assist. Can you please provide an assessment of effects on these surrounding properties, or provide the written approvals if you have them?

Street address	Legal Description	Notes
Mangamaire Road	Lot 2 DP 546734	This is the land surrounding 500 Mangamaire Rd
500 Mangamaire Rd	Lot 1 DP 546734	Subject to Point 1 above
Tutaekara Road	Sec 7 Blk XIV SD Mangahao	This is a gravel reserve and is held by LINZ for Treaty settlement purposes.
346 Mangamaire Road	Lot 2 DP 554906 & Sec 8 BLK XIV SD Mangahao	Subject to Point 1 above
126 Tutaekara Road	Lot 1 DP 401244	Subject to Point 1 above
321 Doughertys Rd	Sections 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, & 85 SO 12824 and Sec 78 Blk XIII SD Mangahao	There is a dwelling some 2km from the site but is orientated towards the subject site with expansive views along the valley.
Doughertys Road	Lot 1 DP 42480 and Sections 79 & 87 Blk XIV SD Mangahao	These blocks are all across the railway line and do not have dwellings on them at

Doughertys Road	Lots 1 & 2 DP 67352, and Sections 65, 66, & 63A Blk XIV SD Mangahao	present. However, potential building sites are likely to overlook the proposed solar farm.
17 Fouhys Road / Doughertys Road	Lot 2 DP 562953, Sec 62A Blk XIV SD Mangahao & Sec 62 Blk X SD Mangahao	
3 Fouhys Rd, Fouhys Rd	Sec 91 Blk S SD Mangahao Sec 90 Blk X SD Mangahao	
187 to 229 Tutaekara Road	Multiple	The dwellings and properties along Tutaekara between the substation and the railway.
41 Fouhys Rd	Multiple	The farm opposite the site over Tutaekara Road.

3. The application states that the solar farm will be 86.93ha in area on a total site area of some 114ha of land. The landscape assessment states that the solar farm will be approximately 60ha within an overall site of 87.47ha. This is a significant difference, and I am not certain whether the landscape assessment has assessed the entire proposal or there is some other reason for the discrepancy. Can you please explain the differences between the two reports and confirm that the landscape assessment has considered the entire proposal? If the landscape assessment has not considered the entire proposal, please have the author amend it so that it does.
4. NPS-HPL – An assessment under the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) has been made in the application. It (in part) relies on the premise that grazing of stock will be able to continue with the solar farm in place. The solar farm’s purpose is to intercept sunlight, which is vital for sustained grass growth.
 - a. What is the long-term viability/sustainability of grass growth and continued grazing under solar farms set out in such an arrangement as this proposed farm?
 - b. If grass growth rates are non-problematic, how well does stock health/conditioning compare between grazing pasture that is grown under a solar farm as opposed to pasture grown in normal farming (non-solar farm) conditions?
 - c. Are stock (sheep/cattle) likely to damage the panels, either through rubbing or chewing, given the panels are only 300mm from the ground when tilted, and will this affect the use of the land for rural based production?
5. An argument has been made that the proposed facility is ‘specified infrastructure’ under the NPS-HPL. At this stage, I agree that it would fall within this category. However, given that the solar farm is proposed to be located on highly productive land, can you please confirm that there is capacity at the Transpower Mangamaire substation and the “MGM-WDV A” or “MGM-MST A” transmission lines to accommodate the additional load expected to be generated from the solar farm. Confirmation from Transpower would be ideal. Are any additional consents required for upgrades to Transpower infrastructure to meet the demand.
6. The adjacent property located at 391 Mangamaire Road contains an existing quarry, as has been noted in the application. Are any reverse sensitivity effects likely to arise from the operation of the quarry immediately adjacent to the proposed solar farm, i.e. from dust? Can you please provide an assessment of any potential or actual reverse sensitivity effect from this site.
7. The application does not discuss decommissioning or provide a decommissioning plan for when the solar farm reaches the end of its functional life. What is the expected life of the solar farm and can you please provide a decommissioning plan for the solar farm?

8. It appears that a resource consent for earthworks would be required from Horizons Regional Council. Looking at the site I would expect that this would be a controlled activity consent, so I do not consider that a joint process is required. However, it would be useful to have this consent in place so that the TDC consent can simply refer to the Horizons approved Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that will be required as part of that consent process. This will provide your client with an integrated approach towards the earthworks and a single plan to comply with – as opposed to a CMP under the TDC consent and a ESCP under the Horizons consent. Can you please apply to Horizons Regional Council for the necessary consents for earthworks.

Statutory Information

The above information is requested under Sections 91 and 92 of the RMA 1991 and processing of the application will be placed on hold from **3 November 2022**

Within 15 working days you can:

- a. provide the information; or
- b. tell the consent authority in a written notice that the applicant agrees to provide the information; or
- c. tell the consent authority in a written notice that the applicant refuses to provide the information.

Once we have received confirmation of your response to our request we must:

- a. set a reasonable time within which the applicant must provide the information; and
- b. tell the applicant in a written notice the date by which the applicant must provide the information.

If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact me on 022 099 2298 or at andrew@evergreenconsulting.co.nz.

Yours faithfully



Andrew Bashford
Consultant Planner