

**SUBMISSION ON RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATIONS**

*Section 96 Of The Resource Management Act 1991*



THE WEST COAST  
REGIONAL COUNCIL

PH: 0508 8000 118

Fax: (03) 768 7133

**TO: THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**PO BOX 66**

**GREYMOOUTH**

Copy to:

Meridian Energy Limited  
PO Box 2454,

**Christchurch.**

**Applicant:** Meridian Energy Ltd

**Application Numbers:** tick boxes overleaf

**Closing Date for Submissions on the Mokihinui Hydro Proposal: (Wednesday 23 April 2008)**

(Please print clearly) Title: Mr Mrs Miss Ms (Please circle the appropriate title(s) or write below)

~~My~~/Our Full Name(s): CRAIG ADAMS SOPHIE BALLAGH

Postal address: Otago Institute of Sport & Adventure  
Otago Polytechnic Private Bag 1910 Dunedin

Wk Ph: 034793731 Hm Ph: 4728762 Cell: 021 705 716

Wk Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ Hm Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: craig.a@tekotago.ac.nz  
sophie.b@tekotago.ac.nz

I/we support the application numbers ticked on the back of this form  (tick one)

~~I~~we oppose the application numbers ticked on the back of this form

The reasons for ~~my~~our submission are as follows (*further information attached (tick for yes)*)

[State in summary the nature of your submission, giving reasons]

we are in opposition to the resource consent applications.  
ticked on the reverse.

~~I~~we wish the consent authority to make the following decision [Give details, including the nature of any conditions]

To decline the application in its entirety  
it is unacceptable.



**Use the tick boxes below to indicate the resource consent applications your submission concerns.**

I/we make ~~my~~/our submission concerning **all** the resource consent applications below  (tick)  
 My/our submission **only** concerns the resource applications ticked below  (tick)

I/we **wish to be heard** in support of my/our submission  (tick one)  
 I/we **DO NOT** wish to be heard and hereby make my/our submission in writing only

Signature(s): *[Signature]* 18/4/08  
*[Signature]* 18/4/08 Date: 18 / 04 / 08

If this is a joint submission by 2 or more individuals, each individual's signature is required)  
 I/we have served a copy of ~~my~~/our submission on Meridian energy Limited as per Section 96(4) of the RMA  (tick)

Consent List

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Mokihinui River<br>consents RC07150/1 – RC07150/6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>               | Earthworks and Vegetation<br>consents RC07150/14 – RC07150/19 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                                   |
| Inundation Area<br>consents RC07150/7 – RC07150/8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>               | General Construction<br>consents RC07150/20 – RC07150/23 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  |
| Staging Area<br>consents RC07150/9 – RC07150/10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                 | Access Roads, Walking Tracks and Recreational<br>Activities<br>consents RC07150/24 – RC07150/26 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Substation and Transmission<br>consents RC07150/11 – RC07150/13 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |   |

Reasons for opposition to Resource consents

## **Lack of Long Term Planning:**

That there does not appear to be any overarching **national strategy for New Zealand's electricity conservation, production and future growth**

Without this Macro plan in the **public forum** how are we to have the ability to have a critical input into the future direction these companies wish to take us.

The way it works now is that you want to build a dam here build a dam there... seems piecemeal and reactionary. How can we make an informed decision on the overall impact benefit?

It is a national issue not a community by community issue.

The present situation could be described as a guerrilla war on the part of the power companies against publicly held rivers of New Zealand.

The rivers are a public asset of the people of New Zealand; they should not be taken for the private profit of corporate entities.

I would like to see a greater study done on the rivers of New Zealand around recreational values that the population of NZ place on rivers, looking at physical factors, use factors, and also to look at Sense of place, identity associated with these riverine environments.

This would be part of beginnings of an overarching National strategy for the future of Electricity production, conservation in a NZ context.

Enforced Conservation should be explored.

The separate corporate entities involved need to work co operatively to further develop what NZ needs not what each profit bottom line needs.

This maybe a large paradigm shift, profit or New Zealand, what is more important, these questions need to be addressed.

## **Heritage Values:**

A pristine wilderness area so close to a national park, as conservation land it should be left as a buffer to the park to foster the conservation values of the national park.

Untouched wilderness, leave it as such... dam an already dammed river?

There is a concept of no net loss of heritage values in NZ. By putting this dam in the Mokihinui ( it being quite a flash NHV river) you would have to elevate another river to the level of the Mokihinui.. Why don't you dam a low heritage value river? Reducing the net loss of NHV ?

## **Recreation:**

The Mokihinui River provides one of the few moderate graded multiday river trips in the South Island, If not New Zealand. A journey into the iconic NZ landscape, the wilderness, we do not want this to be a myth of times past.

Rafting, canoeing, floating, kayaking, riding and walking all valid ways of travel in this wilderness.

It is part of the legacy of Ed Hillary, get outside and enjoy the natural environment, areas for this "enjoyment" are under constant threat from development

Loss of tourism income

## **Environment:**

Water is a renewable resource, when it rains.

Rivers systems are not renewable, once choked by a dam it is all over.

There are a finite number of rivers

No mitigation can replace a pristine river system, no white water park, no lake, no DoC interpretive board.

The biodiversity of this untouched free flowing system cannot be offset or mitigated.

I question the effective life span of the dam due to silt load. Also I question the downstream coastal effects of erosion at the mouth.

Threatened species will be put further at risk