

Before the panel convener appointed under the
Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

FTAA-2604-1207

Under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

In the matter of the Southern Link Inland Port

By Southern Link Property Limited

**MEMORANDUM OF COUNSEL ON BEHALF OF SOUTHERN LINK PROPERTY
LIMITED RESPONDING TO MINUTE 4 – DESCRIPTION OF ISSUES RAISED BY
ADJACENT LANDOWNERS**

5 June 2026



Sarah Scott / Kierra Parker

T: +64 3 365 9914

sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com

kierra.parker@simpsongrierson.com

PO Box 874

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL CONVENER

1. This memorandum is filed on behalf of Southern Link Property Limited (**SLPL**) in accordance with Minute 4 of the Panel Convener dated 4 June 2026 (**Minute**). It provides a description of the issues raised by adjacent landowners (owners and occupiers) during consultation undertaken after lodgement of the substantive application, as requested in [8] and [14](c) of the Minute.
2. As advised at the Convener Conference, SLPL has contacted all adjacent landowners and occupiers¹ and either:
 - (a) held or arranged meetings; and
 - (b) scheduled follow-ups with landowners that have not responded to attempts at contact.
3. Individual meetings were offered with all adjacent landowners. During the meetings SLPL representatives provided an overview of the proposed Southern Links Inland Port (**SLIP**), taking neighbours through the rationale for the proposal and the SLPL partners, design plans and stages, mitigations for key areas including; transport impacts, operations, environmental considerations (noise/light/dust/stormwater), construction phases, and explanation of the fast-track process more generally.
4. SLPL gave further information about any concerns raised. Many of the concerns raised by neighbours were already addressed within the design plans for the proposal, and a constructive discussion about the how effects management measures are built into design plans, occurred where relevant.
5. No specific changes have been requested to the proposal or to the condition set.

1 Except for one neighbour where attempts to contact have not yet been successful. Efforts continue.

6. **Noise**: Landowners asked questions about the noise that will be generated both during the construction and operational phases of the SLIP. Questions related to:
- (a) construction noise;
 - (b) operational noise (including trucks) and hours;
 - (c) rail idling.
7. Operational hours and truck and train movements were explained. Other noise mitigations already built into the application were explained to the neighbours, such as noise attenuation walls, plantings, operational timings and the likely frequency of heavy truck and train movements.
8. One landowner raised a concern about (separate to the SLIP project) KiwiRail on occasion idling outside their property. SLPL explained to the landowner the design of the SLIP siding means that trains will not need to idle outside their residence as they can move into the site and the engine can pull straight out of the site with minimal movements needed.
9. **Traffic**: Adjacent landowners asked questions about increased traffic generated during the construction and operational phase of the SLIP. In particular, neighbours wanted to know about:
- (a) site access/road widening; and
 - (b) the timing of site operations.
10. Operational hours and truck and train movements were explained. It was also explained that the forecast increase in traffic represents about 1% of the existing traffic volume on Gordon Road, or 150 additional heavy vehicles a day when fully operational. The landowners were also pointed to the information in the application detailing site access and road widening.
11. **Stormwater**: Neighbours asked about the stormwater impact of the proposal, and the ability for the SLIP site to hold water and not add to stormwater issues in the Silver Stream and wider Mosgiel area. In response to these concerns, SLPL discussed that the Project is based on a hydraulic

neutrality design and has a mix of swales and on-site retention ponds to avoid increasing flood effects on neighbouring, upstream, or downstream receivers.

12. **Flight path:** Some neighbours asked about the impact that the Project would have on flight paths and how the Project complies with flight operations in its vicinity. An overview of design considerations for the continued safety of flying operations was covered, and the Aviation Report attached to the application was identified.
13. **Cycleway/walking track access:** One neighbour had a preference that any walkway does not enable easy public access to their property.
14. **Dust:** Neighbours raised concerns about the dust generated by construction. SLPL confirmed that the site's development has a plan to mitigate dust, including onsite water storage for dust suppression.
15. **Light impact:** One landowner raised concerns about any potential light spill and how design features will mitigate any light impact. It was explained that the lighting design has aimed to avoid light spill as the lighting faces downwards and there are no skylights in roofing which prevents light bleed from warehousing.
16. **Site location and assessment of alternative site options:** One neighbour wanted to know the reasons for the Project and whether alternative sites had been considered. The suitability of the site including proximity to the Port, being adjacent to the railway and need for the Project was explained.
17. **Improved logistics for region's economy:** one neighbour expressed clear support for the proposal due to the need for improved logistics for the Otago Region's economy.

18. **Effect on horses:** since the Panel Convener Conference, one neighbour has asked to discuss the potential impact of the Project on a horse stud. A meeting is scheduled for 8 June.

Dated: 5th June 2026

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sarah J Scott". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'S'.

S J Scott
Counsel for Southern Link Property Limited