

Your Comment on the Foxton Solar Farm draft conditions

Please include all the contact details listed below with your comments and indicate whether you can receive further communications from us by email to substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz.

1. Contact Details			
Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.			
Organisation name (if relevant)			
First name	Kerry		
Last name	Sketcher		
Postal address			
Home phone / Mobile phone		Work phone	
Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)			

Please provide your comments below, include additional pages as needed.

My overall thoughts on the Panel's consideration of comments from adjoining neighbours to the Solar Plant in your draft decision and conditions is disappointment. I feel we have really been let down and not listened to. I now feel it was a complete waste of time submitting our comments and I would be advising others who face similar solar plant proposals in the future not to bother. I just feel like we're the little guys up against a large corporation and the Government. In a last ditch effort, here are my requested changes to the Draft Conditions and Draft Decision:

Requested changes to Draft Conditions of Consent:

As already expressed, I have serious concerns about the effects of impact piling and construction noise for the whole of my property (not just from my dwelling) for my horses and family working from home. In relation to our horses, I do not take comfort that the Technical Advice submitted by Genesis below refers to freight train railway lines, state highways and bird scaring devices (are they implying all horses could cope with those situations?) I would never have my horses in any of those environments nor are they accustomed to it. Our current environment is the odd tractor or four wheeler once a week and cows grazing.

Apparently construction alongside our property will be for 6 months, including impact piling which is a high noise generating activity, which I do not consider temporary or intermittent (mentioned below), so I need safeguards to be put in place.

12. In respect of potential noise effects, it is not uncommon for horses and livestock across New Zealand to be exposed to intermittent and variable high levels of noise, these include paddocks alongside high noise routes (railway lines carrying freight trains, state highways, etc) as well as localised noise from farm machinery, bird scarers and other rural activities.

13. Further, construction activities would occur progressively across the site, such that exposure at any one boundary location would be temporary and intermittent rather than continuous throughout the full construction period. Given the size of the site and limited high noise generating activities once piling is complete, noise during the majority of the construction periods noise levels are expected to be low and not dissimilar to general rural noise levels.

Due to Genesis advising that solar panels are set back from my dwelling a minimum of 160m, I am unsure whether my dwelling/property will fall within 150 metres of proposed piling conditions noted below in B9A – B10. I would like to make the changes noted below to remove any doubt.

Foxton Solar Farm: Expert Panel Draft Conditions of Consent

B9A Impact piling must be limited to a single mini-pile driving rig when undertaken:

- a. within ~~150~~ ¹⁸⁰ metres of an occupied dwelling between the hours of 7.30am and 6.00pm; and
- b. between 80 and 250 metres of an occupied dwelling between the hours of 6.00pm and 7.00pm.

B9B No piling can be undertaken within 80 metres of an occupied dwelling between the hours of 6.00pm and 7.00pm.

B10. At least **twenty (20)** working days prior to commencing activities authorised by this resource consent (excluding any Enabling Works), the Consent Holder must provide HDC with a CNMP, prepared by a SQEP, for technical certification. The purpose of the CNMP is to develop measures and processes to manage and minimise the adverse effects of Construction noise. The CNMP must address, as a minimum, the measures identified in Annex E of NZS 6803:1999 and must include but not be limited to:

- a. predicted noise levels 1 metre from the façade of occupied dwellings located within ~~150~~ ¹⁸⁰ m of proposed piling works, based on the final selected plant and final layout of the solar farm and BESS, where applicable, and the proposed Construction methodology;
- b. the proposed piling rig ~~manufacturer's make and model~~ and either measured sound levels from installation of piles of a similar size, or ~~the~~ manufacturer's sound power level data;
- c. details of mitigation measures to be applied where predicted Construction noise levels exceed the applicable limits of Condition B8 ~~Table 5~~; and
- d. written communication with the occupiers of all dwellings within ~~150~~ ¹⁸⁰ metres of proposed piling works, at least 10 working days prior to those works commencing, setting out a brief overview of the works, the working hours and expected duration, the mitigation measures to be implemented, and the procedure for recording and responding to noise complaints

Changes to your Draft Decision

The below noted in your Draft Decision is incorrect. I did not seek the removal of the 35ha block. I wanted removal of solar panels over part of that block. Please refer back to my comments and amend your draft.

178 Kerry ~~Sketcher~~³⁰ considered that the solar panels would be too close to their property with resultant unappealing visual impacts. She sought that "heavy duty visual screening be installed until hedging has matured" and the removal of a 35ha block³¹ of solar panels located to the east of their property.

They sought the removal of the same 35ha block of solar panels that was of concern to Ms Sketcher.

Note Genesis response:

Removal of solar panels

32. Ms Shailer has requested that the solar panels on Part Himatangi X Block (35 ha) are removed on the basis that it will have a small impact on the power output but a huge impact for the close surrounding community. Removal of solar panels from this area would result in the loss of some 16MWp (or a 7.2% reduction in capacity). Ms ~~Sketcher~~ has similarly requested the removal of solar panels over part of the same area (a reduction of some 4.5% in capacity).

Thank you for the opportunity of providing feedback.

Kerry Sketcher and family

Thank you for your comments