



20 December 2023

Meridian Energy Ltd
C/- Incite (Wellington) Limited
PO Box 2058
Wellington 6140

By email only: Tom@incite.co.nz

Cc: Lynley.Fletcher@MeridianEnergy.co.nz

Cc: Nick.Bowman@MeridianEnergy.co.nz

Kia ora Tom

Additional Information Request for Application APP-2022203902.00

Horizons Regional Council – APP-2022203902.00

Greater Wellington Regional Council – WAR230312 [39005, 39006, 39007, 39008, 39009]

Tararua District Council – 202.2023.53.1

Masterton District Council – RM 230068

Thank you for your resource consent application in regard to the proposed Mount Munro windfarm lodged on 26 May 2023 and 9 June 2023 with the above Councils. Since the application has been notified and a number of submissions received, it has been determined that in order to fully assess the effects of the project, additional information is required.

The additional information is listed below and is requested under Section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act (the Act):

1. There are relic landslide features (identified via aerial photograph interpretation) on slopes that are crossed by some of the proposed road corridors and within proposed fill areas (refer Google Earth snip below for an example). Please make a comment on these features for the entire wind farm site and advise of considerations related to the stability of road cut batters through and fill placement on the relic landslide features where appropriate, such as targeted pre-construction investigations, slope stability analysis and geotechnical advice during design/construction. Would any necessary stability adjustment related to the features be within the bounds of the existing project?



2. Please provide a plan showing the location of the 'super bin' identified in the PSI within the turbine envelope zone and confirm that earthworks (for example, associated with internal roads) avoid this area.
3. Please identify groundwater takes used for drinking water and the bore locations, and show whether any of the parts of the wind farm are outside the buffer (zone of influence) of these structures.
4. Some of the submissions have raised concerns as to potential contamination of the aquifers as a result of the proposal. Please provide an assessment of any potential effects of the proposal on groundwater quality.
5. One of the submissions highlighted the importance of the watercourses, particularly the Makakahi River and the Kupoaranga River, for trout spawning and migration. Have you given consideration to any potential impacts of the proposal on this, and any potential monitoring that could be undertaken to assess any effects?
6. Please clarify if there is any and/or the nature of any discharge from turbines/nacelles and how the effects of these discharges would be expressed in the receiving environments, including the wetlands.
7. Concerns have been raised in several submissions as to the classification of the waterways as intermittent. It has been raised that these waterways do not stop flowing even through the summer months, and should not be classified as being intermittent. In light of this, please advise if this changes your assessment as to the classification of these waterways and amend if required.
8. To manage fire risk, please provide an assessment of potential effects from the risk of fire on the site and the surrounding area, and confirm how any fire risk will be managed (including matters such as

firefighting water supply and access). Please also advise whether there is a firefighting contingency plan that seeks to mitigate any adverse discharges resulting from nacelles catching fire.

9. Many submissions raised concerns about the timing of construction noise, and the submitted noise assessment shows that some construction works would infringe the 45 dba limit for night works, Sundays and public holidays. Please confirm the proposed timing of construction works and explain if/what nightworks are anticipated and why.
10. Submissions also raised concerns around noise from the proposed concrete batching plant and aggregate crushing. Please provide an updated assessment that includes the likely location, duration of the activity in that location, and hours of operation for these activities to determine potential effects, noting these activities will not meet the definition/standard of a temporary activity under the Tararua District Plan and the Wairarapa Combined District Plan.
11. Conditions offered as part of the application include a Controlled Blasting Management Plan, but rock blasting has not been assessed as part of the application. Please confirm if there will be any rock blasting as part of the proposal and if so, provide an assessment of this activity.
12. If the Operations & Maintenance building is proposed to be placed on the terminal substation site, please provide an assessment of its likely noise effects (noting the submitted acoustic assessment currently only assesses this building at the entrance to the core wind farm site).
13. Many submissions identify an issue with disturbance caused by the previous wind mast that “whistled” in certain winds. Some submissions stated that Meridian ignored complaints in relation to this. Please confirm the background to these complaints and any steps taken by Meridian, and identify any mitigation measures proposed given a taller wind mast is to be constructed.
14. Please prepare and provide a FIDOL based dust assessment. We note that you intend to prepare a dust management plan, and while that will be required, our view is that this cannot be appropriately prepared within an assessment being undertaken to determine what sensitive receptors need to be protected. This is in reference to the whole site, but of particular concern is if the concrete batching plant is going to be on the ridgeline, and therefore has the potential to spread dust over a wider area due to its exposed and windy position.
15. In relation to questions 10 and 14 above, please advise the likely locations of the concrete batching plant and the aggregate crushing facility. The scale and locations of these will feed into the dust and noise assessments referred to above.
16. It has been raised by submitters that the rainfall levels have potentially been underestimated for the Mt Munro area by relying on the rainfall levels for Masterton. Please review whether the rainfall levels used are appropriate and revise if necessary. Is there any intention to undertake monitoring on the site?
17. Thank you for confirming that the Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research Mapping shows LUC3 land within the site. Please confirm if/why you consider this mapping to be of a sufficient scale and detail to accurately locate all highly productive land on the site. If you do not believe it is sufficient, please

provide a soil classification assessment with updated mapping, and an updated assessment that addresses any changes.

18. To assess the proposal against the NPS-HPL, please:
 - a. For clause 3.9(2)(j)(i) – Comment on the operational need for the proposed water storage tank, on-site wastewater treatment, storage facilities, carparking, and operation and maintenance building to be on highly productive land along with the substation (noting that the application already states that the operation & maintenance building could be placed at the Old Coach Road entrance of the site instead), and quantify the total amount of hardstand required for these activities (is this 1.25ha or larger?).
 - b. For clause 3.9(3)(a) – Quantify the amount of highly productive land in Tararua District and the % loss to that land from this application.
19. To assess the proposal against NPS-HPL clause 3.9(3)(b) and respond to wider reserve sensitivity concerns raised in submissions, please outline how you intend to avoid/mitigate any actual or potential reverse sensitivity effects on land-based primary production from the proposal. Please specifically address concerns raised in submissions such as reduced weed and pest control/ difficulties applying fertiliser due to aerial spraying restrictions, and effects on nearby stock.
20. Many submitters raised concerns around shadow flicker, and modelling submitted as part of the application indicates that shadow flicker will go over 30 hours for some dwellings, meaning a curtailment strategy will be required (as provided for in offered conditions). Please outline how this will work in practice - will curtailment be automated or managed manually?
21. Many submitters raised concerns around the potential effects from increased traffic from the construction phase of the proposal. Please provide an assessment of traffic effects in the Eketāhuna township and identify any mitigation needed, including any change in safety for pedestrians crossing the main street as a result of increased traffic flows during construction.
22. Please provide an assessment of potential construction traffic effects (in particular if aggregate is sourced along the route) on Opaki Kaiparoro Road, and identify any mitigation.
23. Please provide an indicative map showing the location of potential aggregate sources. Please also provide an assessment of traffic effects on public roads associated with haulage to and from (movement of rock and also crushed material if using public roads) an on-site crusher, if one is intended. We note that you may need to consider a number of options if there is more than one possible location.
24. Please provide an assessment of road safety effects on Old Coach Road if the road was to be sealed to assist with mitigating dust effects, and identify any mitigation.
25. During the construction period, will there be an impact (safety or otherwise) on rural delivery, and if so is there a proposal to manage these potential effects? Have you sought feedback from Rural Mail to understand whether they have safety concerns delivering mail to properties and if so whether these could be mitigated?

26. The submitted archaeological assessment recommends creating an exclusion zone within the construction laydown area around the former location of a potential pre-1900s dwelling where excavations should be avoided, or if this is not avoidable then having archaeological monitoring of groundworks within the area to identify and record any archaeological features if they are exposed. Will you be updating your plans or offering a condition that reflects this recommendation in your technical assessment?
27. Please clarify the sought lapse dates and expiry dates for the land use consents vs the works within the beds of rivers and provide justification for each.
28. Please provide a thorough assessment of the application against the proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan which was notified in October 2023.
29. Many submitters raised concerns around their social wellbeing, and potential adverse health effects associated with the construction and operation of the windfarm (for example, sleep deprivations, migraines, asthma). Please provide an assessment of the proposal's potential social and health effects.
30. For all questions in this further s92 request, please identify if any of the responses trigger the need for further consents, and provide an assessment of any infringement.

Under the Resource Management Act, you must, within 15 working days of the date of this letter, take one of the following options:

- a. provide the information; -OR-
- b. advise in writing that you agree to provide the information (at which point we would negotiate a reasonable time within which the information will be provided); -OR-
- c. advise in writing that you refuse to provide the information.

If you have any questions in relation to the determination or wish to discuss any aspects of this letter, please feel free to contact the relevant person(s) listed below.

Kind regards



Lauren Edwards
SENIOR CONSENTS PLANNER
Horizons Regional Council



Christina Schierlitz
RESOURCE ADVISOR
Greater Wellington Regional Council



Aimee Charmley
TEAM LEADER PLANNING SERVICES
Tararua District Council



Rosanne Heyes
RESOURCE PLANNER
Masterton District Council