

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
1	William Hugh Sloan	Support	No	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWDC affirmed desire to deliver improved environmental outcomes at WWTP's</li> <li>• Improve treatment processes and land treatment/disposal most sustainable way to achieve goal.</li> <li>• Renewal application consistent with above philosophy and context and outcome with MWWTP and GWWTP consents.</li> <li>• Proposed staged improvement programme for Featherston is tailored to deliver the outcomes over time targeted at achieving a sustainable balance between improved environmental outcomes and capital works affordability.</li> <li>• Supports 35 year consent term – consistent with MWWTP, GWWTP and CDC Daleton farm site.</li> </ul>
2	Linley Thorburn	Oppose	No	Decline	No detail given on nature of, or reasons for their submission.
3	Robert Perry Cameron	Oppose	Yes	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has asked GWRC to request SWDC to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- replacing the use of irrigators with sub-surface drip lines on the Featherston waste water discharge to land blocks. Provides detail on benefits of sub-surface drippers.</li> <li>- planting Manuka throughout discharge to land blocks to enhance treatment of any runoff (into Wairarapa Moana).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4	Heather Margaret Murphy	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the intended site for waste treatment (disposal): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- directly on route to Lake Moana which is a popular wetland for breeding and nesting birds, and a popular camping location.</li> <li>- land is prime lifestyle property, great showcase for the district, would provide great profit to council from land sales.</li> <li>- concerns over effects on wind on neighbouring properties.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
5	Janette Mavis Devenport	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the proposal will affect her ability to sell her land in Longwood Road.</li> </ul>
6	Colin Richard Burt	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hodders Farms was purchased without ratepayer consultation or input.</li> <li>• Crossing Murphy and Longwood Road is pushing grey matter into and near the town and housing on the boundary, gives no thought to future growth of town</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
7	Beverly Marie Bowles (Rogers)	Oppose	No	Decline	and lifestyle growth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to FWWTP ponds being located down the road.</li> </ul>
8	Andrew Peter Walker	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate consultation with people affected by the proposal, submitter provides detailed background information and examples of this.</li> <li>• Irrelevant data has been used to support a foregone conclusion – submitter provides detail on why this is the case.</li> <li>• Concerns for negative impact on family's health, environment and economic well-being.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding spray-drift and E.coli on their cider apple orchard and business implications.</li> <li>• Land could be used for accommodating future growth of Featherston population.</li> </ul>
9	Sally Jean Walker	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWDC has undertaken the process without meaningful consultation with the community it will affect.</li> <li>• Have used flawed assumptions and cherry picked data to back up a foregone conclusion.</li> <li>• Agree with the view that the current treatment going into the creek and lake need to be cleaner but have concerns over the land placement and some detail of the FWWTP discharge to land application.</li> <li>• Proposed location is not suitable for many lifestyle block owners – especially northern and eastern areas of the proposed site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- maps used in application documents are too old and don't reflect the current environment and built up areas.</li> <li>- proposed site cuts Featherston and South Featherston, will stifle future growth and disconnect current Featherston and South Featherston communities. Featherston is restricted with areas for future growth due to proximity to Rimutakas but proposed area for discharge is an attractive area, not in shadow of Rimutakas that has seen a lot of growth recently.</li> <li>- negative effects on tourist activity in the future with Murphy's line being</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<p>direct access to the Lake.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- agree that moving wastewater out of Donald's Creek is in line with national water quality measures but isn't in line with better living environments or social aspects, regionally development or economic prospects – area is now far too built up with Featherston's growth and expansion of lifestyle block owners now in close proximity to the site.</li> <li>- concerned regarding potential impacts on their commercial apple orchard.</li> <li>- No indication of assistance from SWDC with regard to their produce and ensuring the community feel safe to continue to purchase product (World Health Organisation Guidelines), or if there will be any business responsibilities as a result of the WWTP being nearby.</li> <li>• No indication in consent application where the proposed new holding ponds will be situated in future – should be specified to residents, with community agreement, before consent is granted:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no indication of whether smell of ponds or irrigated material will be contained to the site - of particular concern considering high density of new housing and Featherston's wind direction.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned about water springs in the area becoming contaminated, impacts on food safety for consumption and sale, no analysis done on their springs (to their knowledge).</li> <li>• The wind analysis carried out is not suitable for the conditions. Martinborough and Tauherenikau wind is very different to Featherston and South Featherston wind. Wind analysis should be carried out at proposed site.</li> <li>• Concerned property will be devalued.</li> <li>• Concerns over continued discharge into the Lake. High Rate Treatment (HRT) option is more suitable that will further reduce contaminants entering the lake and potential groundwater and bore contamination.</li> <li>• No provisions in consent for tree screening, particularly for North and East areas, to negate spray drift and other negative effects.</li> <li>• Allocated buffer zones are not fair or adequate:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- buffer zones should be taken from property boundaries, not dwellings as</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
10	Romain Busby	Oppose	No	Decline	<p>this limits what people can do on their property in future e.g. building extensions closer to boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of engagement with community before application.</li> <li>• Submitter recommends three preferred options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- an HRT option to purify wastewater.</li> <li>- council look for more suitable land, no less than 3km from Featherston or South Featherston, to process with new project and consent process.</li> <li>- restrictions or amendments on current proposal- submitter goes into detail about 6 particular restrictions reflecting points discussed within submission.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Would prefer consent duration of 5 – 10 years, not 35 years.</li> <li>• Current proposal not suitable or in best interests of locals socially, environmentally or economically.</li> </ul>
11	Bronwen Brown	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of dispersal site is too close to residences and growth of Featherston has not been taken into account.</li> <li>• Other systems that would result in a cleaner end product and would cope better with pressures of population growth.</li> <li>• A cleaner end product could be dispersed without smell and possible contamination to the Lake.</li> <li>• Possibility of a malfunction of the dispersal system is frightening. Submitter feels current proposal is not a P.C proposal and that long-term effects and ramifications have not been investigated.</li> </ul>
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application does not prevent contaminants entering the lake – would prefer cleaner approach to filtering the wastewater by way of high rate treatment.</li> <li>• 35 year duration is not appropriate, prefer 5 years – submitter gives detail as to why.</li> <li>• Want to see filtering of wastewater to a higher standard (A grade) before it is discharged to land.</li> <li>• Buffer zones to residential areas not enough – increase to 300m from private boundaries and roadsides with tree screening.</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land area selected is too close to towns of Featherston and South Featherston</li> <li>Wind measurements used in the application are not consistent with the land proposed (wind direction is incorrect).</li> <li>Map does not show all the current dwellings.</li> <li>Projected growth of Featherston is misrepresented.</li> </ul>
12	Kathryn Margaret Seagrave	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about effects on local bores, streams and Lake Wairarapa.</li> <li>There are alternative methods that can be easily implemented, cost effective and using 21<sup>st</sup> century technology.</li> </ul>
13	Alan Brown	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application does not prevent contaminants entering the lake – would prefer cleaner approach to filtering the wastewater by way of high rate treatment.</li> <li>35 year duration is not appropriate, prefer 5 years – submitter gives detail as to why.</li> <li>Want to see filtering of wastewater to a higher standard (A grade) before it is discharged to land.</li> <li>Buffer zones to residential areas not enough – increase to 300m from private boundaries and roadsides with tree screening.</li> <li>Land area selected is too close to towns of Featherston and South Featherston</li> <li>Wind measurements used in the application are not consistent with the land proposed (wind direction is incorrect).</li> <li>Map does not show all the current dwellings.</li> </ul>
14	Jeremy Thurlow Thompson	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal does not align with SWDC LTP.</li> <li>Location of farm is in area that best allows for future growth.</li> <li>This type of plant will negatively impact on local business and tourism opportunities.</li> <li>Proposal allows for partially treated sewage into waterways – unacceptable given available technology.</li> <li>Plant located in area with high water table makes it impossible to ensure effluent will not get into water ways.</li> <li>35 years is too long.</li> <li>No analysis of alternative options.</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
15	Dale Sandra Julius	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No link to Whaitua planning for water quality.</li> <li>Fixing storm water pipes should be priority.</li> <li>Has asked GWRC to request SWDC to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>replacing the use of irrigators with sub-surface drip lines on the Featherston waste water discharge to land blocks. Provides detail on benefits of sub-surface drippers.</li> <li>planting Manuka throughout discharge to land blocks to enhance treatment of any runoff (into Wairarapa Moana).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Concerned about effects on streams, Lake Wairarapa and nearby school.</li> <li>Environmental, social and cultural effects on Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa are unacceptable.</li> </ul>
16	Kaylene Ihaia	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As kaitiakitanga of our land and waterways we have a responsibility to care for and look after our environment for the prosperity of our future generations to come.</li> </ul>
17	Raukawa Woodhouse	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Own a commercial olive grove that shares boundary with land being consented</li> <li>Oppose application due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effects of contaminated spray drift on olive trees and their Olives NZ food safety programme.</li> <li>contaminated spray drift not allowing them to provide safe and healthy work environment for grove workers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>contaminated spray drift will affect future saleability of the property.</li> </ul>
18	Mark Oliver and Kathleen Grace Bunny	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not believe that proposed treatment option is correct solution to address Featherston's issue of waste treatment.</li> <li>Concerned about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>spray drift contaminating roof water supply.</li> <li>odour may prevent recreational activities occurring on Donald St.</li> <li>people using Donald St may be exposed to contamination from spray drift.</li> <li>contamination of water table due to high level of water table.</li> <li>objects to partially treated effluent being discharged to land when alternative options are available.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
19	Diana Rosslyn Leahy	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not believe that proposed treatment option is correct solution to address Featherston's issue of waste treatment.</li> <li>Concerned about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>spray drift contaminating roof water supply.</li> <li>odour may prevent recreational activities occurring on Donald St.</li> <li>people using Donald St may be exposed to contamination from spray drift.</li> <li>contamination of water table due to high level of water table.</li> <li>objects to partially treated effluent being discharged to land when alternative options are available.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- long term effect on Lake Wairarapa and water ways.</li> <li>• Application does not correctly address population growth and proposed WWTP will not be a sufficient solution for population.</li> </ul>
20	Campbell Moon	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned council wants to spray contaminants to water, land and air.</li> <li>• Cultural and historic buildings and sites will be affected by proposal (Longwood Tarurika, Tewharerata Pa site, Te Ate Awa and the first astronomical observatory).</li> <li>• Concerned with 35 year consent considering the importance of water purity.</li> <li>• Environmental reasons – i.e. pollution to Lake Wairarapa.</li> </ul>
21	Duncan and Joan Smith	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental reasons – i.e. pollution to Lake Wairarapa.</li> </ul>
22	Kylie Richards	Oppose	Yes	Decline	No detail given on nature of, or reasons for their submission.
23	Elizabeth Ward	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Odour across Featherston unacceptable and would result in house prices going down.</li> </ul>
24	Michael John Topp	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Badly thought out proposal – wrong location.</li> <li>• Too long re. action.</li> </ul>
25	Gary Stewart Philip	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns re. runoff to streams, aquifer and odour to atmosphere.</li> <li>• 35yr duration is too long.</li> </ul>
26	Barbara Mary Anna McLean	Oppose		Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harm to aquifer.</li> <li>• Human waste just banned as fertiliser in China now SWDC considering same thing here.</li> </ul>
27	Gary Emmett Nicholls	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to human waste going on to farmland.</li> <li>• Will negatively affect aquifer.</li> </ul>
28	Ted Dukhorst	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential contamination – E.coli.</li> </ul>
29	Anne Hannah	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clean Lake Wairarapa should be end goal.</li> <li>• Investment in proper treatment system with no spraying.</li> </ul>
30	James Curry	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long periods of time while contaminated water will be in ponds - over winter.</li> <li>• Proximity to town is unacceptable – there is another option.</li> <li>• Problems with smell and property values affected.</li> </ul>
31	Karyn Carter	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consent duration too long.</li> <li>• Land could be sold to pay for higher quality water.</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
32	Ian and Rose Evans	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too close to submitters home.</li> <li>• There are other places/options available within SW district.</li> </ul>
33	Barbara Page	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest in best solutions being put in place now not later.</li> </ul>
34	Marianne McMillan	Oppose		Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants SWDC to investigate alternative options.</li> <li>• Concerns re. odour.</li> <li>• Property values will decrease due to odour.</li> <li>• Could impact underground water supplies.</li> </ul>
35	Joe Knowles	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about odour affecting the town.</li> </ul>
36	Cristopher Mark Hoskins	Oppose		Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants immediate progress with reducing inflow and infiltration of storm water into sewage system – wouldn't need more storage ponds if this was done in 2013-2019.</li> <li>• Discharge water must be of a quality acceptable to farmers and Fonterra.</li> </ul>
37	Wayne Thurston	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Odour and contaminants in the spray is unacceptable for rural and urban areas.</li> <li>• Discharge only high quality water to land, not contaminated water.</li> <li>• Concerned tourism and events will be negatively affected.</li> </ul>
38	John Minford	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed development will undermine public perception of heritage-listed Longwood Estate and overall cultural value of Wairarapa</li> </ul>
39	Ian David Miles	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned re. airborne contaminants from wind to nearby properties and township.</li> <li>• Wants assurance that freshwater tanks will not be contaminated by airborne contaminants.</li> </ul>
40	Geoff Thurston	Oppose	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter was initially in favour of any improvement to quality of discharge from present sewage treatment system – submitter describes present drawbacks of the present system.</li> <li>• Level of contamination is reduced and the stormwater issue is not addressed with the proposed improvements.</li> <li>• Should be looking at treating wastewater to a drinkable standard.</li> <li>• Stormwater inputs into sewage system should be fixed before improvements made to treatment of wastewater.</li> </ul>



## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
41	Scott Ronald Maurice Reid and Shirley Jane Pautu	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slightly polluted is not good enough.</li> <li>Have two bores that they rely on for drinking and Creek used for watercress and eels.</li> <li>Lake Wairarapa needs to be protected from any waste to purify the lake.</li> <li>Concerned about compensation for loss of value to their land.</li> </ul>
42	Rebecca Hudson-Lowe	Oppose	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spray zone is too close to residential dwellings, South Featherston and Featherston schools and township.</li> <li>Too many unknowns and mistakes in application with not enough research done.</li> <li>Harm to land for future generations is huge.</li> <li>Concerned re. council keep adding pollutants to Lake Wairarapa.</li> <li>Site is on main road to Lake that visitors and tourists use.</li> <li>Economic, social and cultural costs to Featherston residents unacceptable.</li> <li>System to be installed need to be able to grow with the population.</li> <li>Featherston could lead the way in finding a sustainable, environmentally friendly option that will enhance the environment.</li> </ul>
43	Graham William Hodder	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residence is within 100m of the council's land boundary.</li> <li>Concerned about effects of spray drift onto roof where their drinking water is collected.</li> <li>Concerned council will continue to irrigate in wind over 12 m/s.</li> <li>Aerosol drift and odour are a major concern.</li> <li>Lack of information available in respect to infrastructure.</li> <li>Water quality in winter months and effect on ground water quality.</li> </ul>
44	Mark Edward Lucock	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter is the closest dwelling on downwind side of predominant wind.</li> <li>Serious concerns for health and welfare - concerned spray drift will land on roof and garage which are drinking water collection areas.</li> <li>Sudden wind changes will mean mitigation not able to be in place quick enough to stop effects.</li> <li>Incorrect predominant wind analysis – wrong site used.</li> <li>Lack of mitigation measures for odour if it eventuates.</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about bore and groundwater contamination.</li> <li>Better systems available which are more compatible with the environment and town growth/expansion.</li> <li>Water returning to the Lake is not good for restoration of the wetland and other environmental elements.</li> <li>Devaluation of properties in the immediate vicinity and affecting ability to sell properties.</li> <li>Recreational pursuits would be soured by spreading of wastewater.</li> <li>Proximity to school, school access route and access route to the lake.</li> <li>Method of wastewater distribution is wrong and not practical for land chosen and where it is situated.</li> <li>Featherston needs a new wastewater system but one better suited to the type of land chosen.</li> </ul>
45	Anthony North	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor option given water table.</li> <li>Not treated to a high enough level for aerial dispersion.</li> <li>Concerned about SWDC ability to manage system correctly – mismanagement means very bad ramifications for environment and township.</li> </ul>
46	Malcolm Morgan	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost</li> <li>Groundwater pollution</li> <li>Smell</li> <li>Property devaluation</li> <li>Generally bad for Featherston</li> </ul>
47	Shaun O'Brien	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many properties affected by this method of discharge.</li> <li>Map within application does not show all properties.</li> </ul>
48	Warren Hans Preiss	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned wastewater is not treated to a high enough standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- contamination hazard to land &amp; water tables, Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa.</li> <li>- not treated to an acceptable, or equivalent, high standard as required by Fonterra.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Application not consistent with part 2, 5(2) of RMA</li> <li>Effects on South Featherston school not adequately defined</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
49	Melanie Anita Jean Preiss	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System may soon be out of date with future regulations and discharge treatment standards:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cost to ratepayers if new system required</li> <li>- needless irreparable contamination of land</li> <li>- high rate treatment considered a feasible alternative</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Premature to lock in proposal before Waitua and Regional Plan review determine permissible values of discharged water.</li> <li>• Economic, social and cultural costs to Featherston are unacceptable.</li> <li>• Future population growth greatly underestimated.</li> <li>• Incorrect map in application – does not show all properties.</li> <li>• 35 year duration too long given constantly developing technologies.</li> <li>• Concerned about:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- effects on land and water (contamination).</li> <li>- effects on Wairarapa Moana wetlands and taonga.</li> <li>- continued degradation of Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa.</li> <li>- adverse impacts of sewage discharge on habitat, amenity, aesthetic and recreational values.</li> <li>- adverse effects from cumulative contaminants from catchment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Current proposal fails to improve quality of wastewater to Donald's Creek, fails to meet purpose of RMA, RPS, GW freshwater plan.</li> <li>• No conditions proposed for effects of land discharge (monitoring and compliance).</li> <li>• Other solutions are superior e.g. MBR treatment system.</li> </ul>
50	Kaden Anderson	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two creeks run through spray zone (Donald's and Abbotts):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- costly and problematic to divert/re-direct to avoid spray zones.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Need to re-think the whole proposal.</li> </ul>
51	Mary Byrne	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application has many inaccuracies that make it unable to be relied upon for an informed decision:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- map, wind direction, projected population growth – submitter provides detail/example on three main inaccuracies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Due consideration not been given to the effect of proposal on residents:</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proximity to residents' houses, loss of property value – submitter provides detail/examples of value losses.</li> <li>• Council rejected (consulted on) HRT system to buy land for waste water disposal without due consultation – submitter provides background information/examples of this</li> <li>• Far better alternatives for around same price and produce a better outcome:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HRT system e.g. Turangi.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
52	Diana Hughes	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important wetlands</li> <li>• Devaluation of land</li> <li>• Unacceptable discharge into Donald's Creek</li> <li>• 35 year duration is too long</li> </ul>
53	Julia Reed	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land is not suitable:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high water table, strong wind</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Land is valuable for housing development/town spread and has cultural and historical significance.</li> <li>• 35 year duration is too long – while leaking stormwater into old infrastructure is not addressed.</li> <li>• Incorrect information in application.</li> <li>• Alternative options not fully investigated.</li> <li>• Cost to environment and ratepayer not acceptable.</li> <li>• Discharge into lake &amp; Donald's Creek unacceptable.</li> <li>• Effects on recreation and tourism.</li> <li>• Devaluation of land &amp; properties.</li> </ul>
54	Lynne Hanks	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater pipes need to be fixed first to remove pressure on current system.</li> <li>• Proposed system not suitable for Featherston – high water table.</li> <li>• Growth of Featherston means site will become more central.</li> <li>• Further degrade Lake Wairarapa.</li> <li>• Recommends land is sold and further investigations undertaken into a more suitable system for needs and environment.</li> </ul>
55	Julia Elizabeth Marino	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land is not suitable</li> <li>• Degradation of lake – lake needs protection</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
56	Kathleen Patricia Gray	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tourism will be diminished</li> <li>• Wants alternatives researched</li> <li>• Water and sewage pipes need replacing, stormwater drains are insufficient.</li> <li>• Lake Wairarapa should not be polluted, should be used as a wetland, fish and birds and as a recreational area and potential tourism to bring in money.</li> <li>• 35yrs is too long – pollution will damage long term environment.</li> </ul>
57	Nicholas Reed	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35yrs too long</li> <li>• Land is not suitable – should be used for housing/future growth.</li> <li>• Would devalue properties in the area.</li> <li>• Proposed system is old-fashioned.</li> <li>• Continue discharge into Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa unacceptable – cultural and heritage significance.</li> <li>• Incorrect information in application – e.g. wind direction.</li> <li>• Alternatives not properly assessed.</li> </ul>
58	Madison Reed	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land not suitable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- water table too high - need to discharge to lake is unacceptable.</li> <li>- valuable area for recreation, potential for tourism, heritage site and cultural significance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 35yrs too long.</li> <li>• Leaking stormwater system needs to be fixed urgently.</li> <li>• Concerned about limited life of system and what to do with land when it can't take anymore discharge.</li> <li>• Alternatives not properly explored.</li> </ul>
59	Maud Bot and Albert Wagebaert	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter was not included in initial Council communication.</li> <li>• House or bore not included in documentation and not classified as a sensitive receptor.</li> <li>• Concerns about thoroughness of research and analysis of work done for the application and subsequent reliability of the proposal.</li> <li>• Concerned that operational/management/monitoring plans not available until 6-18months after consent commencement, whether they will be publically available (not only through Community Liaison Group), plans are important to</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<p>get understanding of the overall proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter includes three directions they would like contained within the plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- their bore included in GW sampling regime.</li> <li>- infrastructure designed and installed in manner that will not exceed agreed buffers.</li> <li>- how will information about system failures reach the public?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned about good husbandry of SWDC – submitter provides examples from the application as to why.</li> <li>• Concerned that application does not mention filtration of drugs and medication from the wastewater.</li> <li>• Location needs to be reconsidered to accommodate future growth of Featherston.</li> <li>• Application incorrectly assumes zero growth.</li> </ul>
60	Pae tu Mokai o Tauira	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides detail about how Lake Wairarapa is provided for in the Wairarapa Combined District Plan (high value, significance), the RMA and the schedules of the pNRP.</li> <li>• Alternative options available that uphold custodial responsibility of how a significant waterbody should be managed.</li> <li>• 35yrs is too long with ongoing discharge into Donald's Creek and cumulative effects on Wairarapa Moana unacceptable.</li> </ul>
61	Julia Day	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal will have detrimental impact on whole of Featherston community- detrimental impact on house/land prices around facility and wider area- investment to create full treatment plant would alleviate wastewater issues and line up with NZ's clean green image- odour/contamination for people and future land use- negatively affect growth of Featherston.</li> </ul>
62	Timothy Lewis	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports drive to clean up waterways but believes this proposal is damaging to Featherston and South Featherston: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- number of properties affected and in neighbourhood of proposal.</li> <li>- perception of Featherston as a 'dumping ground'.</li> <li>- detrimental to tourism.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
63	Jenny Leigh Devenport	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not provide full treatment –discharges to Donald’s Creek to occur in winter months for 70% of years modelled – not in line with SWDC LTP of treating wastewater with minimal effects on environment.</li> <li>- inflow and infiltration reduction should be in place now</li> <li>- concerned about fully informed decision if odour management plan and environmental monitoring plan not yet available.</li> <li>- incorrect population growth assumption.</li> <li>- restrict growth opportunities for South Featherston.</li> <li>- would rather investment in maintenance of existing infrastructure to reduce total water flows and implementation of full treatment plant that would be resilient to population growth and increasing environmental requirements.</li> </ul>
64	Lee Carter	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is the closest dwelling on downwind side of predominant wind.</li> <li>• Health concerns - drinking water supply is via house and garage roof – garage is located 17m from boundary of land where wastewater will be spread.</li> <li>• Worried about roof being covered with spray before wind mitigation measures are put in place.</li> <li>• Incorrect predominant wind analysis – wrong site used.</li> <li>• Concerned how odour will be mitigated.</li> <li>• Decrease in property values of surrounding area.</li> <li>• Crossing over Murphy’s Line will halt town growth.</li> <li>• Impacts on recreational activities that currently take place.</li> <li>• Alternative options should be investigated more thoroughly.</li> </ul>
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social, cultural and environmental concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 35 year duration is too long</li> <li>- consultation process</li> <li>- material contained within the application</li> <li>- social impacts on town</li> <li>- cultural report attached to application</li> <li>- draft strategy on wastewater provided with application</li> <li>- quality of wastewater to land</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					- cost to ratepayers
65	Robert Hanks	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed system unsuitable:</li> <li>high water table, small window for discharge to land, continued to discharge to Lake Wairarapa unacceptable.</li> <li>Investigate other cost and environmentally effective options.</li> </ul>
66	Fiona Phillips	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a healthy option for long term environmental care.</li> </ul>
67	Emma Phillips	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests alternative – construct a wetland and discharge it there as it is more sustainable.</li> </ul>
68	Rhys Bretherton	Oppose		Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsustainable way of disposing sewage – use of a wetland would benefit council's need to dispose of sewage - sustainable choice for long term solution.</li> </ul>
69	Eleanor	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsustainable way of disposing sewage – use of a wetland would benefit council's need to dispose of sewage - sustainable choice for long term solution.</li> </ul>
70	Amanda Shannon James	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of research into long term impacts to environment, area and community, lack of understanding of community and environment.</li> <li>Other discharge/treatment options available.</li> </ul>
71	Jade Walker	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste could be dealt with in more environmentally friendly way e.g. wetlands.</li> </ul>
72	Aiden Gage Pogson	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doesn't agree with sewage entering waterways.</li> </ul>
73	Cheryl Margaret Iro	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wastewater treatment through filtration through wetland is preferred option, e.g. Gisborne, Kaitiaki Dairies.</li> <li>long term, environmentally sustainable and acceptable answer to waste management.</li> </ul>
74	Kirby Bradbury-Mills	Oppose		Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not in the rivers but not this proposal either.</li> <li>More sustainable ways of using sewage.</li> </ul>
75	Francis Rayner	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human waste may get carried with the wind and cause odour issues for the town and may end up in waterways.</li> </ul>
76	Maori Standing Committee for South	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly advocates for an immediate, upgraded WWTP that produces the highest quality of discharge and is discharged to land where soaks and</li> </ul>



## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
	Wairarapa District Council				<p>penetration occurs to meet cultural objectives of cleansing the wastewater.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed upgrades represent a once in a generation opportunity to meet the cultural needs of iwi.</li> <li>• 35yr duration is too long with ongoing discharge into Donald's Creek and cumulative effects on Wairarapa Moana unacceptable.</li> </ul>
77	Francesca Emms	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- effects to human health from contamination to the air, water and soil. Cannot be mitigated.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Social, cultural and economic reasons</li> <li>• Believes that SWDC unable to manage such an undertaking due to history of mistakes and compliance history: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- mistakes in their proposal (wind and map</li> <li>- poor compliance record</li> <li>- poor management of drinking water resulted in failing of MoH standards</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
78	Joanna Howard	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about odour impacting patrons of their bar.</li> <li>• Concerned about being sprayed by sewage while walking dogs</li> </ul>
79	Michael Henry Howard	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the lack of consultation with landowners.</li> </ul>
80	Andrew Simpson	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes for following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- unfairly decreases the financial, historic and productive value of surrounding land – impacted by spraying contaminants on adjacent land</li> <li>- application incorrectly assesses number of properties that will be affected – out of date map.</li> <li>- not a sound economic or future proof option – centralised regulation on water systems – spraying land will render it useless for future use, explore alternatives properly.</li> <li>- prevailing wind assessed incorrectly.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
81	Karen Milkaera	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes wastewater to land plan based on risk that it poses to surrounding waterways and thereby the Lake.</li> <li>• Proposal based on unrealistic forecasted population growth for Featherston.</li> <li>• Treatment should be to A grade level.</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity for regeneration of the lake.</li> <li>• 35yr duration too long with ongoing discharge to Donald's Creek and cumulative effects on Wairarapa Moana unacceptable.</li> </ul>
82	Wendy Anne Devenport	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hinder growth of town</li> <li>• Too close to residences</li> <li>• Devalue properties</li> <li>• Location unsuitable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- too windy, too many water springs, high water table</li> <li>- will go into other water supplies</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Impacts on land sales and development</li> </ul>
83	Brigitte Heuser	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area of Longwood Road is historical and should be protected.</li> <li>• Risk to drinking water, gardens and water cress, in spray zone.</li> <li>• Risk to school children and people carrying out recreational activities.</li> <li>• Impacts on tourism from spray drift.</li> </ul>
84	Featherston Community Board	Neutral	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable to support or oppose the proposal and fully represent the community as there are conflicting views and opinions.</li> </ul>
85	Claire Bleakley	Oppose	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the application as it is not the best practicable option.</li> <li>• Supports any move to discharge tertiary treated wastewater to land.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- public consultation unsatisfactory – submitters thought a HRT system was still to be implemented but discharging to land not water.</li> <li>- consent and appendices out of date – written between 2011-2016, council has not assessed the suitability of the proposal once Wairarapa Moana is managed by Ngati Kahungunu, many technological advances in treatment systems since 2016.</li> <li>- inaccuracy of information – population/growth, wind direction.</li> <li>- threat to the health of surrounding community and loss of economic viability and livelihood.</li> <li>- harm to the Wairarapa Moana and Wetland habitat.</li> <li>- harm to soil, air and water.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
86	Joe Byrne	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- application has ignored Wastewater technologies available to clean the water to an acceptable standard.</li> <li>- Submitter has provided significant detail and examples on areas of concern</li> <li>• Application contains inaccuracies and cannot be relied upon for an informed decision - map missing sensitive receptors, predominant wind, growth of Featherston.</li> <li>• Better alternatives available.</li> <li>• Due consideration not given to effects on residents.</li> <li>• Decision to reject HRT system and buy land for wastewater disposal without consultation.</li> </ul>
87	Andrew John and Dianna Jane Hosnell	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWDC should investigate other options to ensure best fit for Featherston and its waterways.</li> <li>• Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inaccuracies in application: incorrect map, wind direction and speed, population growth, distance to township.</li> <li>- land values</li> <li>- unsuitable location: high water table, spray drift to drinking water supplies (roofs), potential to contaminate bores and water race.</li> <li>- risk of E.coli from ineffective treatment.</li> <li>- cost to ratepayers</li> <li>- no management plans in place</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
88	Anton Gerard van Opdorpe	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35yr duration too long</li> <li>• Environmental, social and cultural effects on Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa unacceptable.</li> <li>• Continued discharge into Wairarapa Moana</li> <li>• Alternatives not fully investigated</li> <li>• Effects of discharge to aquifer</li> </ul>
89	Chris Reed	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35 years is too long</li> <li>• Continued discharge to Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa unacceptable</li> <li>• Stormwater pipes should be fixed immediately</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
90	Kathryn Tyree	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land location and site conditions not suitable</li> <li>• Land devaluation</li> <li>• Health impacts on recreational users of area</li> <li>• Inaccuracies in application</li> <li>• Area is culturally sensitive – important wetland</li> <li>• Location and land conditions not suitable</li> <li>• 35yrs too long</li> <li>• Effects on Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa unacceptable</li> <li>• Alternatives not investigated properly</li> <li>• During water restrictions wastewater should be reused for gardens and firefighting.</li> <li>• Stormwater infrastructure should be fixed</li> </ul>
91	Daniel Robert Reed	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35 years is too long</li> <li>• Devaluation of land/property</li> <li>• Land location and site conditions unsuitable</li> <li>• Effects on Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa unacceptable</li> <li>• Inadequate protection of waterways and aquifers</li> <li>• Alternatives not investigated properly</li> <li>• Effects on tourism</li> </ul>
92	Josiah Kine	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land and site not suitable: location, proximity to town, waterways, impacts on growth, devaluation, recreation and tourism.</li> <li>• Continued discharge to Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa unacceptable</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs urgent attention</li> <li>• Alternatives not fully investigated</li> <li>• Inaccuracies in application</li> </ul>
93	Katherine Jane Beattie	Oppose	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35years is too long given:</li> <li>• Impact on wellbeing of Featherston community: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- health of Lake and health of community are connected.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SWDC past performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- draft newsletter attached to application as wastewater strategy</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 35 year duration unacceptable for a project not guided by a long term strategy</li> <li>• Environmental, social and cultural effects on Lake Wairarapa</li> <li>• Economic, social and cultural costs to urban Featherston ratepayers:</li> <li>- concerned detailed financial planning has not been carried out.</li> <li>• Devaluation of land and property, effects on recreation and tourism</li> <li>• Environmental conditions not suitable – wind, water table</li> <li>• 35yrs too long</li> <li>• Stormwater inputs costly</li> <li>• Inaccuracies in application - wind, growth, affected properties</li> <li>• Alternatives not fully investigated</li> </ul>
94	Olivia McHughe	Oppose	No	Decline	
95	Graeme Josephson	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35 years too long</li> <li>• Continued discharge into Lake Wairarapa unacceptable</li> <li>• Devaluation of land and limits growth, effects on recreation and tourism</li> <li>• Environmental, social and cultural heritage effects on Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa.</li> <li>• Inaccuracies in application</li> </ul>
96	Chris Davis	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35 years is too long</li> <li>• Stormwater inputs costly</li> <li>• Land and site not suitable requiring continued discharge to water, cultural and historic site.</li> <li>• Valuable land for housing and expansion, effects on recreation and tourism</li> <li>• Inaccuracies in application</li> <li>• Alternatives not fully investigated</li> </ul>
97	Robert Reed	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land not suitable for proposed discharge</li> <li>• 35 years is too long</li> <li>• Continued effects to Lake</li> <li>• Incorrect information in proposal</li> <li>• Stormwater inputs need fixing first</li> </ul>
98	Helena Elizabeth	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land not suitable for discharge</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
	Cumming				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative options should be investigated</li> </ul>
99	Kim Maree Goodall	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information in application out of date/incorrect – sensitive receptors, wind direction</li> <li>35 years is too long</li> <li>Sell land and look for better option</li> </ul>
100	Neal John Goodall	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information in application out of date/incorrect – sensitive receptors, wind direction</li> <li>35 years is too long</li> <li>Sell land and look for better option</li> </ul>
101	Alan Brook	Oppose	No	Decline	No detail given on nature of, or reasons for their submission
102	Jack Grabham	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No prior info given by SWDC</li> <li>Environmental, social and cultural damage</li> <li>No consideration for Featherston</li> </ul>
103	John Bushell	Oppose		Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flawed application                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wind recoding not on site</li> <li>nearby residences missing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
104	Sucinno Vermeltfoort	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects of discharge to life in Abbots Creek</li> <li>Other ways to use effluent e.g. cropping</li> </ul>
105	Nicola Yortt	Oppose	No	Decline	Oppose current proposal as their house would be affected by southerly winds
106	David John Goodall	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information is full of mistakes</li> <li>35 year consent term is too long</li> </ul>
107	Julie Buckley	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding spraying contaminants in close proximity to houses, schools etc.</li> <li>Incorrect map</li> <li>Prevailing wind not taken into account</li> <li>Other options should be investigated</li> </ul>
108	Julie Ryan	Oppose	Yes	Decline	Concerned about effects contaminants will have on surrounding land and properties.
109	Fred Mwila	Oppose	Yes	Decline	Concerned with contamination of proposed area

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
110	Marguerite Mary Tait-Jamieson	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is environmentally unsound               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- spraying of contaminants at odds with NZ's clean green image</li> <li>- no management plan to mitigate effects on groundwater, odour, spray drift or surface water</li> <li>- continue discharge to Donald's Creek, further polluting Wairarapa Moana</li> <li>- discharge via seepage</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Major risks to health and wellbeing of the community of South Featherston and wider:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- contamination of food – orchards, water cress etc.</li> <li>- bore water contamination</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Area will be negatively affected economically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- devaluation of land/property</li> <li>- limits areas for town growth and development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recreational opportunities diminished:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- effects of spray drift – no proposed mitigation measures</li> <li>- access route to Wairarapa Moana</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cultural and historical sensitivities have not been addressed               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- documentation for cultural viewpoint not current</li> <li>- effects on heritage sites</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Applicants document is not fit for purpose               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- multiple errors in application</li> </ul> </li> <li>• No faith in applicant's competence to manage proposal               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- poor compliance history</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lack of public consultation</li> <li>• Submitted provides significant detail and background information on the aforementioned points of concern</li> </ul>
111	Linda Ann Cooper	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fall in property values</li> <li>• Unsuitable site location:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high water table – concerned about bore contamination</li> <li>- high winds – drinking water contamination</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Better options available that have not been investigated</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
112	Gary Edward Cooper	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about pets bringing contaminants inside on their feet</li> <li>Fall in property values</li> <li>Unsuitable site location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>high water table – concerned about bore contamination</li> <li>high winds – drinking water contamination</li> </ul> </li> <li>Better options available that have not been investigated</li> <li>Concerned about pets bringing contaminants inside on their feet</li> <li>Weather data used in application is incorrect, there is data available from much closer sources.</li> <li>Incorrect wind data means revision of spray-able days needed</li> <li>Concerns about spray drift</li> <li>Ill considered, scientifically dubious and environmentally dangerous and sully proposal.</li> <li>Organic farmer concerned with proposed spraying of contaminants</li> </ul>
113	Dr Neil K McCallum	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about high ground water level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contaminated water will easily access groundwater/drinking water sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>Concerned about the storage pond capacity and further discharge to the Lake and Creeks.</li> <li>Weather data in application is inaccurate and misleading</li> <li>Spray should be Fonterra standard</li> <li>Concerned about the health of people using Longwood Road and Murphy's Line.</li> </ul>
114	Geremie Randall Barne	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trustee/Occupier of Longwood Heritage Precinct – located 42m SE of disposal site.</li> <li>Proposal not consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, NPS-FM, RPS or Regional Plans</li> <li>Does not meet non-complying activity status test</li> <li>Concerns around Longwood site, Heritage status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>negative impacts on home and business from being adjacent to effluent disposal and potential for odour or spray drift, visual and amenity effects</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
115	Blair Stout	Oppose		Decline	
116	Keith Snell	Oppose	Yes	Decline	
117	Garrick Ralph Emms	Oppose	Yes	Decline	



WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- concerned there are no mitigation proposals such as tree screenings/windbreaks</li> <li>- proposal does not consider its effects on, or protect, Category 1 historic and heritage values of Longwood from inappropriate use and development under s 6(f) RMA</li> <li>• Effects on Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- impact of contaminated water being discharged and quantity of discharge</li> <li>- supports reducing discharge to contaminants to lake, rivers, land and air but concerned not achieved until 2038.</li> <li>- continued discharge to water for 20 years</li> <li>- have applied for an outdated and polluting scheme when other options are available, does not meet s107 RMA test.</li> <li>- contamination of paddocks used for grazing of stock and impacts on livestock – adopt Fonterra Title 22 water quality standard.</li> <li>- impacts on flora and fauna and stream ecosystems in waterways around the spray area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Historical background to 2017 AEE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- stormwater inflows should be fixed before enlarging wastewater treatment scheme.</li> <li>- concerns about SWDC ability to deliver and monitor a reliable and healthy solution.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Errors in the application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cut and paste of technical reports, outdated technical reports</li> <li>- recommendation to swap from HRT to land based is not supported by original information.</li> <li>- incorrect information, errors and omissions in application (number of affected dwellings, location of bores, groundwater levels, climatic data, population, growth, inconsistencies with information provided at public meetings).</li> <li>- how can correct assessment be made on incorrect information</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Economic effects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- economic viability of Longwood</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rates increases</li> <li>- decrease in land values</li> <li>• Impacts on Tourism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- direct access to Lake Wairarapa, tourists will have to go past warning signs, purple baleage.</li> <li>- Carkeek Observatory now in spray zone</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cultural: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- impacts on ability to collect watercress and wild mushrooms</li> <li>- submitter acknowledges concerns of iwi and supports them</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Impacts on health and drinking water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sensitive receptors not properly identified</li> <li>- spray drift, pollution of gardens, fruit trees, water and amenity effects associated with long term exposure to odour</li> <li>- impacts/contamination of water races through high groundwater levels, run-off, spray contamination</li> <li>- clean up waterways and lake so they can be used for recreational activities, improve water quality</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of consultation and information on other options considered by SWDC and change from HRT to discharge to land resulting in lack of public knowledge or understanding</li> <li>- no consultation with Waste Water Combined Steering committee</li> <li>- exclusion from meetings for those greater than 25m from Hodder Farm</li> <li>- decisions made without public consultation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Wastewater technologies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- problem is not with discharge to land but with contaminants within that discharge</li> <li>- make discharge of a higher quality e.g. tertiary polishing system to allow for more options for use</li> <li>- submitter provides significant detail about alternative technologies that are being implemented elsewhere</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
118	Stephen Dunstan	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 35 years too long</li> <li>- if consent were granted, should only be for short term (4 years) for existing activities, with discharge restricted to existing WWTP site, with stringent conditions on set-backs and buffers to protect residences from spray drift and odour, to allow for other options to be explored</li> <li>- I and I stormwater program must be implemented now</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submitter provides Heritage NZ Report for Longwood</li> <li>• High water table at location limiting amount of time able to discharge to land and more discharge to the lake</li> <li>• Upgrade the wastewater infrastructure to minimise volume requiring treatment</li> <li>• There are alternative options that completely treat waste</li> <li>• Concerns about system coping with growth of Featherston</li> </ul>
119	Janine Deborah Price	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot support SWDC application while following issues are unaddressed:</li> <li>• High wind speeds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wrong weather/wind data with no relevance to site</li> <li>- submitted provides possible mitigation measures – increased planting buffer zone, application to forestry, drip irrigation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Vulnerable groundwater and waterways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- concerns of contamination (e-coli, nitrogen and mineral leaching) of drinking water supplies – bores and rainwater</li> <li>- concerned that spray drift, wastewater flow rate to land and overflow rate to Donald's Creek will mean wastewater will run-off or be discharged into the Lake and/or potentially contaminate surrounding properties</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Close proximity of residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- incorrect number of nearby dwellings</li> <li>- no information provided to recent land purchasers/developers that they would be in close proximity to the spray area</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SWDC poor history of compliance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wastewater treatment system in an area vulnerable to possible</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
120	Patrick Buckley	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<p>contamination requires a high level of monitoring, administration and management – concerned SWDC cannot provide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed scheme will devalue property values and impact on Featherston historic values and the health and overall wellbeing of residents.</li> <li>Other alternatives e.g. Turangi.</li> <li>Questions what level of impact the reduction of human waste will have on the waterways and if the contribution from intensive dairy farming has been considered in the proposal.</li> </ul>
121	Patricia Rose Heuser	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative effects on groundwater and surface water</li> <li>Offensive odour and discharge to air will occur</li> <li>Negative effects on human health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>school and nearby houses not taken into account in application</li> </ul> </li> <li>Diminish amenity value of area and undermine economic value of properties</li> <li>Risk to plants, animals and ecosystems</li> <li>Adverse effects on heritage sites ( observatory site, Longwood Homestead)</li> </ul>
122	Mark Thornton	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to discharge to land limited by strong winds and high water tables</li> <li>Concerns about odour and unsightliness</li> <li>Contamination of bore water</li> <li>Devalue properties</li> <li>Trickle irrigation, with native plantings, should be used instead</li> </ul>
123	Ronald Mark Cheesman	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extra stress on health care system from health risk to both human and animals from partially treated waste.</li> <li>Spray drift to nearby properties, school, waterways and drinking water bores</li> <li>Proposal may stunt growth of Featherston</li> <li>35 years is unacceptable</li> <li>Effects on Donald's Creek and Lake Wairarapa are environmentally unacceptable.</li> <li>Social effects on rate payers funding a proposal they don't want.</li> </ul>
124	Regional Public Health	Neutral	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support SWDC progressively reducing discharges into waterways</li> <li>Recognises poor recreational water quality is one of key environmental factors contributing to reduced well-being and health outcomes in the Wairarapa.</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discharge to waterways has more than just physical implications for health (particularly iwi health).</li> <li>Support proposed conditions 26 and 27 regarding signage</li> <li>Not opposed to proposing staging timeframes but they should be seen as a maximum with any deviations to be discussed with regulatory agencies.</li> <li>Recommend that wording for a consent condition for stage 2b gives consideration to reflect that disposal technologies and treated wastewater demand may alter over next 17yrs.</li> <li>Happy to participate in CLG for FWWTP</li> <li>Request that appropriate monitoring conditions are imposed to ensure no adverse effects on groundwater – submitter provides information and examples.</li> <li>Satisfied that provided setback distances comply with Combined District Plan, then this is appropriate and likely to ensure aerosols (including odour) will not cross the boundary.</li> <li>Unable to determine from AEE whether final decisions have been made on use of land.</li> <li>Wants conditions structured to cover emerging contaminants for soil.</li> <li>Should consent be granted, submitter wishes that adequate conditions to protect the health of people and communities. Submitted provides particular areas of concern for conditions to cover.</li> </ul>
125	Dianne Connell	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to discharge to land limited by strong winds and high water tables</li> <li>Concerned about odour and drinking water bore contamination</li> <li>Devalue property</li> <li>Trickle irrigation, with native plantings, should be used instead</li> </ul>
126	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HINZPT)	Neutral	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission relates to the impact of the proposal on archaeological sites and the potential for adverse effects on heritage values. Submitter had the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Category 1 Historic place, Longwood Homestead, located 300m from edge of proposed irrigation field- Carkeek Observatory is on the edge of the application site – being subdivided off.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
127	Anthony John Morsinkhof	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lake Wairarapa is of significance for cultural heritage for Wairarapa Maori</li> <li>- Archaeology Authority will be required for work on the site prior to earthworks, an assessment will need to be provided to HNZPT.</li> <li>- Any work on Carkeek observatory will require Archaeological Authority</li> <li>- Submitter seeks consultation about requirements before any work on site or on the Carkeek Observatory.</li> <li>• Economic value of the land for use vs. its acquisition cost. Other land could be acquired for lesser value in an area affecting less people and benefiting ratepayers.</li> <li>• Chosen site for discharge of effluent would limit growth of town and recreational activities.</li> <li>• Council has land available to sell that could be subdivided for more housing and therefore provided increase income to be used for a more sophisticated treatment solution.</li> <li>• Devaluation of property, economic impacts on business growth, commercial and tourism impacts.</li> <li>• Impacts on viability of Longwood, loss of a heritage and historical asset of the Wairarapa, less tourists, guests, weddings etc.</li> <li>• SWDC has not taken social effects into account - land purchased without people in the area knowing – causing stress to people.</li> <li>• Other land available for this solution that will affect less/no people, other treatment solutions available.</li> <li>• Submitter has concerns regarding purchase of land without being subject to resource consent.</li> </ul>
128	Moyra Joan Pearce	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on nearby properties from contaminants</li> <li>• Effects on ability to use the road to walk to school/for recreation</li> <li>• Roof drinking water contamination</li> <li>• Human and animal health risk</li> <li>• Better solutions available e.g. Turangi and Timaru</li> <li>• Effects on wider residents of the region e.g. holiday makers</li> </ul>
129	John Redmond Phillips	Oppose	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes application in its current form but would support short term consent</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
130	Powerco Limited	Neutral	Yes	With condition	<p>if it included conditions to address concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- requirement to consider and evaluate other options</li> <li>- substantive consultation with affected parties and community to co-design a satisfactory solution</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infiltration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of action of addressing infiltration problems into the network</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Land purchased: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- poor due-diligence undertaken on purchase of Hodder Farm with respect to suitability for effluent disposal</li> <li>- conflicting information in application</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consideration of alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- range of alternatives and way they are analysed is inadequate</li> <li>- community not involved in discussion of alternatives</li> <li>- large quantities of complex information for people to read through – communication fail</li> <li>- range of alternatives unnecessarily large and lacks consideration of most relevant options</li> </ul> </li> <li>- MCA technique used for analysing options was inadequate and not used correctly</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omitted alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- community members had to do their own research</li> <li>- polishing treatment option will provide more flexibility for disposal options e.g. drip irrigation – removing spray drift risk.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of effective consultation with Featherston Community including on range of options and favoured options.</li> <li>- lots of people now unsupportive of this application</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Seeks to ensure applicant is aware of existing assets within the site and street and that they are relocated safely by an approved contractor if need be.</li> <li>• Any irrigation equipment or mobile plant complies with the mandatory NZ Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances.</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek to ensure no discharge of irrigated material onto electricity line conductors or insulators.</li> <li>Advice notes to be added to the consent – submitter provides examples of advice note wording.</li> <li>Seeks to ensure compliance with relevant regulations for community and individual safety and continuity of supply.</li> <li>Concerned that not enough research has been undertaken into long-term effects that wastewater scheme will have on the water table.</li> </ul>
131	Jan Marie Thurston	Oppose	No	Decline	
132	Riki Hiemer	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental effects on Wairarapa Moana wetlands and taonga</li> <li>Not enough thought has been put into management to ensure future economic and environmental prosperity of land and waterways.</li> <li>Not enough community consultation</li> </ul>
133	Peter Jon Dozell James	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative options not investigated before decision made on system</li> <li>Negative impacts on community, property values and environment</li> <li>Factual inaccuracies in application – prevailing wind and growth expectation</li> <li>Poor monitoring of existing system</li> <li>Proposal of 30 years is unacceptable</li> <li>No public consultation</li> </ul>
134	Daniel Meemia	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property value decline due to the proximity to spray zone</li> <li>Health risks for Featherston residents from over spray</li> <li>Odour risks</li> <li>Economic risk to ratepayers is unacceptable</li> <li>Lack of consultation with community</li> </ul>
135	Robyn Jo-Anne Ramsden	Support	Yes	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal does not impact negatively on environment or community</li> <li>Timeframes should be reduced where possible (to land quicker, instead of water, for the sake of water borne fauna in rivers an Lake Wairarapa).</li> <li>Buffer zones normalised to 50m from water waterways</li> <li>Buffer zones between proposed spray to land area and existing houses and boundaries be no less than 50m from dwellings.</li> <li>Opportunity to develop synergistic income source on same land should be taken.</li> </ul>



## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
136	Georgia Marguerite Jamieson Emms	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes for environmental, social and economic reasons</li> <li>• No consultation</li> <li>• Reduced amenities/recreational activities</li> <li>• Risk of contamination of food</li> <li>• Risk of contamination of drinking water</li> <li>• No substantive investigation into impacts and effects and no alternatives offered.</li> <li>• Effects of spraying contaminants near historical buildings – Longwood</li> <li>• Economic effects for businesses in close proximity and drop in property values</li> <li>• Repeated errors in proposal and poor compliance record give little confidence</li> </ul>
137	Aidan Darcy Goodall	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative effects on property value</li> <li>• Stressful environment for neighbouring properties</li> <li>• Continued discharge to creeks and lake</li> </ul>
138	Matthew Peter Wood	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental effects on vegetation and crops</li> <li>• Contamination of runoff and local water table</li> <li>• Chosen location means possibility of contamination health risks to people and demeaning in nature.</li> </ul>
139	Fionnuala Mary Kelly	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of the site means concerns that there may be odour effects on her home.</li> <li>• Consider alternatives to bio-degrade the effluent to the point that smell is eradicated.</li> </ul>
140	Mason Guy Jarratt	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over levels of monitoring and whether 'safe' levels of contaminants will be able to be guaranteed.</li> </ul>
141	Karen Coltman	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water table too high – should be treated then discharged to the lake</li> <li>• Unacceptable discharge into Donald's Creek – fauna, recreational activities</li> <li>• Odour issues from strong winds</li> <li>• Not long term economically sensible</li> <li>• Potential location for growth</li> </ul>
142	Kate Harper	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on environment and ecosystem</li> <li>• Harm to crops, land, atmosphere, waterways and living species</li> </ul>

**WAR170229 Summary of Submissions**

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
143	Virginia Love and Liam Glancey	Oppose		Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close proximity to the boundary on Murphy's Line</li> <li>• Effects of spray onto their property – potential technical failure of sprayers.</li> <li>• Seepage onto submitters property - high water table</li> <li>• Contamination of roof/tank water supply</li> <li>• Potential for ammonia odour</li> <li>• Loss in property value</li> <li>• No consultation when going through consent process for house and septic tank in 2015.</li> </ul>
144	Emily Ruth Pearce	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health risks to children – covering grass and equipment at school</li> <li>• Risk to growing food and vegetables</li> <li>• Historical precinct – Longwood House – should be honoured</li> <li>• Effects on recreational activities</li> <li>• Lack of consultation – particularly with Iwi</li> <li>• Alternative options e.g. reverse osmosis</li> <li>• Contaminated drinking water for animals</li> </ul>
145	Andreas Sebastian Heuser	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal should be declined for the negative environmental effects on South Featherston environment and communities.</li> <li>• Negative effects on groundwater and surface water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proposal risks contamination to groundwater and thereby drinking water supplies of nearby properties, school etc.</li> <li>- application does not provide sufficient certainty that contamination of groundwater can be ruled out or minimised</li> <li>- concerned that SWDC will not be able to effectively comply with conditions imposed to manage the water resource.</li> <li>- proposal risks contamination to Donald's creek and Longwood water race, being on or close to the discharge site, risk of airborne contamination and also possible contamination of Wairarapa Moana.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Offensive odour and contaminants discharged to air: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- offensive odour and contaminants will be discharged to air and neighbouring land.</li> <li>- prevailing wind at the site is strong and will make it impossible to retain</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
					<p>the discharge to the site (odour and contaminants), prevailing wind direction assessed incorrectly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- application fails to note 30 houses near the discharge site – proposal will affect more people than stated.</li> <li>- inadequate assessment if mitigating factors</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious negative actual and potential effects on human health:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- contaminants will affect drinking water and pose risks to human health</li> <li>- contaminants may affect food sources (mushrooms, watercress)</li> <li>- high risks of e-coli and bacterial and viral pathogens</li> <li>- Havelock North inquiry highlighted high risk to human health of proximity of effluent to drinking water sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Negative effects on amenity:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- discharge site proposal will place loss of amenity for nearby properties and people enjoying local amenity</li> <li>- population is growing, SWDC estimates are flawed</li> <li>- proposal will impose large discharge structures, signage, risks to human health</li> </ul> </li> <li>• High risk to plants, animals and ecosystems:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- discharge of pathogens to plants, animals and ecosystems</li> <li>- poor compliance performance means no faith placed on minimisation measures or conditions imposed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Effects on heritage sites:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- diminish heritage values of a number of sites</li> <li>- spray drift effects on Longwood homestead</li> <li>- historic value of NZ observatory lost</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Undue reliance on engineers and commercial relationship prejudicing proper consideration of options:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- purchase of the land pre-dated SWDC unbiased analysis of possible options.</li> <li>- concerns around ability to have a view on best practicable option when large amount of work already done on discharge to land.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
146	Sustainable Wairarapa	Support	Yes	With condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- other available options have not been properly analysed</li> <li>Support the objective of deficit irrigation and that by discharging to land, initially in the summer months, there will be an improvement in quality of Donald's Creek.</li> <li>Does not support 35years for the development strategy outlined in the application.</li> <li>Issue of stormwater I &amp; I needs to be addressed as a first requirement before long-term treatment and disposal is determined, lack of willingness from SWDC to do so in the past.</li> <li>While I &amp; I is being rectified, submitter supports a short term consent to permit on land deficit irrigation in line with proposed stage 1A.</li> <li>Short term consent recommended by submitter does not commit SWDC to any increased expenditure but allows the initial phase of development to be undertaken so that an informed decision can be made as to the next phase .</li> <li>Supportive of the CLG – community representatives should be paid.</li> <li>Successful implementation of the I &amp; I will impact on groundwater levels and base stream flows, possibly lifting them – no analysis of effects of this within application.</li> <li>Possibility that sewage and storm water enter Donald's Creek no addresses.</li> <li>Poor quality up stream of plant is likely due to town and farmland contributions.</li> <li>Potential that effluent is lost from leaking sewage pipes into the ground/groundwater.</li> <li>Discharge from the ponds has low clarity and elevated suspended sediment load with impacts on Donald's Creek – does not appear to be addressed within the application.</li> <li>Until I &amp; I is completed then operational requirements of FWWTP will not be fully understood.</li> </ul>
147	Stanley Jack Rogers	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>35 year duration is too long</li> <li>Lack of consultation on options</li> <li>Odour and overspray effects</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
148	Bette Jean Rogers	Oppose		Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximity/location of WWTP – too close to town</li> <li>Impacts on groundwater quality – high water table and porous ground</li> <li>High water table</li> <li>Not enough effort/thought into proposal</li> <li>Council has kept information to themselves</li> </ul>
149	Helen Philippa Forlong	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health risks with contact with effluent , bore contamination, roof/rainwater contamination.</li> <li>Recreational activities</li> <li>High water table may be contaminated and allow for contamination of streams/lake.</li> <li>Risks to food supplies, particularly for Iwi – mushrooms, watercress</li> <li>Lack of filtration for chemicals entering the system – methamphetamine, chemotherapy drugs.</li> <li>Economic and historical impact on Tarureka estate</li> <li>Alternative options available e.g. Turangi system</li> </ul>
150	Nick Mason	Oppose	Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative effects to health of population (particularly school pupils and nearby residents).</li> <li>Discharge into water ways diminishing river quality and drinking water possibility.</li> <li>Risk to native flora and fauna</li> </ul>
151	Catherine Rosalie		Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative methods not fully considered given the frequent limitations to current proposal</li> <li>Concerned that sufficient evidence of recordings of wind data have been mapped and analysed for true viability</li> <li>High water table - true analysis not carried out</li> </ul>
152	Helena Glover	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risks to air, land and water from this proposal</li> <li>Location means great risk to human health</li> <li>More research needed on ongoing effects and alternative solutions</li> </ul>
153	Jim Hedley		Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wishes GWRC to require SWDC to meet the standards that others are required to meet to discharge to land.</li> </ul>

## WAR170229 Summary of Submissions

Submitter number	Submitter Name	Support Oppose Neutral	Heard Yes/No	Decision Grant Decline	Submission summary
154	Mary A Phillips		Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wishes GWRC to require SWDC to meet the standards that others are required to meet to discharge to land.</li> </ul>
155	Kenneth Ryan		Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wishes GWRC to require SWDC to meet the standards that others are required to meet to discharge to land.</li> </ul>
156	Witarina Owens		Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wishes GWRC to require SWDC to meet the standards that others are required to meet to discharge to land.</li> </ul>
157	Kirsten Price		Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wishes GWRC to require SWDC to meet the standards that others are required to meet to discharge to land.</li> </ul>
158	Juanita McLellan		Yes	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wishes GWRC to require SWDC to meet the standards that others are required to meet to discharge to land.</li> </ul>
159	Julia Parry and Ray Glover	Oppose	No	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One of proposed sites is close to their dwelling</li> <li>More effective and safe options available that don't provide risk to the environment.</li> </ul>