



Pareekshit Parihar [REDACTED]

Fwd: Another updated set of conditions - FNSF The Point - RMA261598

John Andrews [REDACTED]

30 January 2026 at 14:22

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Laila Alkamil [REDACTED], Pareekshit Parihar [REDACTED], Richard Homewood [REDACTED]

Alan,

Hopefully this is helpful.

The stormwater is described in the SSR that Pareek sent you. If you have questions please ask Pareek.

Many thanks,

John

John Andrews
General Manager

E. [REDACTED] | [W. fnsf.co.nz](http://W.fnsf.co.nz)

Far North Solar Farm Ltd
Level 1 Office, 65 Main Road,
Kumeu, Auckland 0810

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Reuben Herz-Edinger** [REDACTED]
Date: Fri, 30 Jan 2026, 12:44
Subject: RE: Another updated set of conditions - FNSF The Point - RMA261598
To: Laila Alkamil [REDACTED]
Cc: Richard Homewood [REDACTED], John Andrews [REDACTED], Dwayne Daly [REDACTED]

Kia ora Laila,

Thank you for the time on the phone earlier.

The "groundwater take" in the application I referenced was in Section 6.10, p. 50/113.

It's only a brief comment around the sub-soil drainage system included in the GIP/substation stormwater system.

I think we both recalled discussing this previously, but I couldn't find written confirmation of this.

Some stormwater systems (e.g., sub-soil drainage, stormwater basins) intercept highest groundwater levels and discharge this to surface water, and CRC considers that to be a groundwater take.

However, where the system doesn't intercept groundwater, which seems likely for the site at The Point, there is no "take" of groundwater for drainage/stormwater systems (i.e., where the system is only draining rainwater from above).

So, as we previously discussed, it doesn't seem likely that the stormwater systems for the substations would constitute a groundwater take.

If you could confirm the depth of subsoil drainage system, and estimated groundwater depths at the substation locations, that would be great in confirming this.

Written confirmation that FNSF are not seeking any groundwater take consent (as part of the current Fast-track process) would also be ideal.

As for the conditions, we discussed the potential options around having a set of 'common' conditions between the CRC and MDC consents, which the specific CRC/MDC consents could refer to.

I believe this approach has been taken for some CRC consents, and I'll reach out to our planner who consented Meridian's Waitaki hydro scheme to see what that looks like.

Though, as discussed, if the project gets granted and consents are issued, there would still need to be separate consents for each CRC/MDC consent required, and it would likely be necessary to re-draft the format you currently have to accommodate for this, as the panel noted.

We're happy to work with you on what this format looks like, and I'll get back to you if I can find relevant examples of CRC consents with joint conditions.

I also mentioned that we're meeting with CRC experts next Wednesday to discuss their current advice and the conditions, so it would be great to have the latest set of conditions proposed by FNSF before then.

Happy to keep in touch with progress before our s53 comments are due on 19 Feb.

Best regards,

Reuben

IN-CONFIDENCE

From: John Andrews <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, 23 January 2026 1:24 pm
To: Reuben Herz-Edinger <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Laila Alkamil <[REDACTED]>; Richard Homewood <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Another updated set of conditions

Caution: This is an email from an external party. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Thanks for your comments this morning, I have forwarded that to Laila.

Please find attached a set that Laila updated this week for us to include kaitiaki forum conditions.

We are also correcting the vehicle numbers to match our application (15 trucks per day).

Thanks,

John

John Andrews.

General Manager
(I am based in Wellington)

E. [REDACTED] | M. [REDACTED] | W. fnsf.co.nz



Far North Solar Farm Ltd
Level 1 Office, 65 Main Road,
Kumeu, Auckland 0810



Pareekshit Parihar [REDACTED]

RE: FNSF RFI Reponse 1.3 Hazardous Substance.pdf - RMA261598

Reuben Herz-Edinger [REDACTED]

4 February 2026 at 12:42

To: Richard Homewood [REDACTED]

Cc: John Andrews [REDACTED], Laila Alkamil [REDACTED], Pareekshit Parihar [REDACTED]

Dwayne Daly [REDACTED]

Kia ora Richard,

Thank you for sending that through for our review.

I agree that there would be no requirement for a consent to discharge minor contaminants under 5.100.

There is another potential trigger for the storage/use of hazardous substances in CLWRP Rules 5.179-184, specifically 5.181 which allows for the storage/use of hazardous substances (as below).

We previously touched on this in the RMA consent applications in our s92 RFI, but didn't follow-up once the application was placed on hold.

The only potential consent trigger I can see is Condition (3), which would require monthly inspection of the stored substances if the site is staffed.

I see in the RFI response you note "Regular inspection and maintenance of transformers and containment infrastructure will be undertaken".

If that included monthly inspection of transformers (and the other conditions of 5.181 are met, which seems achievable), then the use/storage of mineral oils would be permitted under the CLWRP (as seems to typically be the case for other sites storing mineral oils, e.g., substation sites).

It would be good to include Rule 5.181 in the RMA section of the RFI 1.3 response.

Provided that FNSF can comply with the Conditions of 5.181, I would agree with the conclusion of the RFI 1.3 response that no additional consent would be required from the Expert Panel in relation to hazardous substances.

Best regards,

Reuben

5.181 The use of land for the storage, other than in a portable container, and use of a hazardous substance listed in Part A of Schedule 4 is a permitted activity, provided the following conditions are met:

1. The substance is approved under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 and the storage and use of the substance is in accordance with all conditions of the approval; and
2. A current inventory of all hazardous substances on the site is maintained, and a copy of the inventory shall be made available to the CRC or emergency services on request; and
3. For hazardous substances stored or held on or over land, all areas or installations used to store or hold hazardous substances are inspected at least once per month or annually if the site is outside of any area or zone identified in a proposed or operative district plan for residential, commercial or industrial purposes and is unstaffed, and repaired or maintained if any defects are found that may compromise the containment of the hazardous substance; and

Page | 160

Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

4. For hazardous substances stored or held in a container located in or under land:
 - (a) if there has been any physical loss of product, then the Canterbury Regional Council shall be notified within 24 hours of confirmation of the loss; and
 - (b) records of stock reconciliations over the past 12 months shall be made available to the CRC upon request. If requested, a copy of the stock reconciliation and the most recent certification of the container shall be provided to the CRC within five working days; and
5. For substances stored within a Community Drinking-water Protection Zone as set out in Schedule 1:
 - (a) all hazardous substances on a site are stored under cover in a facility which is designed, constructed and managed to contain a leak or spill and allow the leaked or spilled substance to either be collected or lawfully disposed of; and
 - (b) spill kits to contain or absorb a spilled substance are located with the storage facility and use areas at all times and
6. Except where the storage was lawfully established before 4 July 2004 and the maximum quantity stored has not increased since that date, or the storage relates to transformers and other equipment associated with electricity infrastructure, the substances shall not be stored within:
 - (a) 20 m of a surface waterbody or a bore used for water abstraction; or
 - (b) 250 m of a known active fault that has a recurrence period of less than 10,000 years, and the land is:
 - (i) over an unconfined or semi-confined aquifer; or
 - (ii) within 50 m of a permanently or intermittently flowing river or a lake

(ii) within 50m of a permanently or intermittently flowing river or a lake.

5.182 The use of land for the storage, other than in a portable container, and use of a hazardous substance listed in Part A of Schedule 4 that does not meet one or more of the conditions in Rule 5.181 is a discretionary activity.

IN-CONFIDENCE

From: Richard Homewood [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 4 February 2026 10:44 am
To: Reuben Herz-Edinger <[redacted]>
Cc: John Andrews [redacted]; Laila Alkamil [redacted] Pareekshit [redacted]
Dwayne Daly [redacted]
Subject: Re: FNSF RFI Reponse 1.3 Hazardous Substance.pdf

Caution: This is an email from an external party. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Also cc'ing Dwayne

On Tue, 3 Feb 2026, 4:05 pm Richard Homewood, [redacted] > wrote:

Hi Reuben

Please see attached draft response to the panel RFI on hazardous substances

Can you please advise if ECAN has any feedback on the attached report?

Cheers

hard Homewood.

Director

E. [redacted] | M. [redacted] | W. fnsf.co.nz



Far North Solar Farm Ltd
Level 1 Office, 65 Main Road,
Kumeu, Auckland 0810

