

Notes For Oral Submissions:

- Introduction : Blair Judd presenting –
 - In my personal capacity as a near-by resident and local on behalf of my wife and children
 - As a representative of the South Coast Neighbourhood Society

With respect to my Personal Submissions

- I'm not going to re-hash these, I just want to note on a personal basis I feel let down by the council's lack of any meaningful consultation with respect to this proposal given our proximity to the proposed site and also the lack of consultation with the community as they appear to have dismissed any perceived effect as being too remote to Brighton as a whole.
- I have not been party to RMA proceedings before, however the nature of this application, the backward and forward between the ORC and DCC and the opposing views on earthquake risk, leachate risk, downstream effects, fire risk and completeness of the application as a whole has left me frustrated with how to respond to this application and what to expect if this application is accepted.
- I feel that given the constantly changing and adapting of the councils position/proposal throughout this process it has been impossible to assess just what the effects of the proposal will be on a personal basis to my family and to adequately respond.

With respect to the South Coast Neighbourhood Society's submission and Brief of Evidence:

- I'm speaking on behalf of the South Coast Neighbourhood Society, effectively a united Brighton Community and a Community united in its opposition to this landfill.
- You will have my brief of evidence before you, again I won't re-hash that, but I would just like to address a few points that has been raised in other evidence
- Before I do that I just want to re-emphasize the effect this landfill, if approved will have on everyone in our community.
 - We swim and our children swim in the waters below this landfill,
 - We fish, gather and eat ki-moana downstream and on the coast from this landfill meets the sea
 - We use the hills surrounding the proposed site for biking, riding horses, walking dogs and generally exploring and enjoying nature
 - All of this is at risk if this application is allowed to proceed!
 - With this at stake the community is extremely concerned that a landfill and all the requirements that go into a modern landfill are not 'shoe horned' into an old designation and siting which appears not to be suitable in this day and

age (and if submitted 3 days later would have been treated under much more stringent criteria).

Turning now to points raised in my Evidence:

- Leachate:
 - I understand varying, low amounts have been given for seepage if the membrane (which we still do not know the exact makeup of) is used.
 - With respect to leachate as a community we are particularly concerned with those Pollutants that stick around and build up. As I understand they are known as Persistent Organic Pollutants.
 - From listening to the Experts on liners for these types of landfills I understand the liners will break down, its just a matter of when. One expert says as little as 10 years the expert for the applicant has indicated out to 150 years.
 - There seems no clarity, as a community we are very concerned with any breakdown – is there a point where these persistent organic pollutants, if exposed do not cause harm. Certainly if the shorter timeframe of 10 years is taken into account I believe the concerns of the community are fully justified.
 - As a community we bear this risk, our children bear this risk. The council has had ample opportunity to address this risk and they still have not.
 - If the liner does perform at least mostly as the council says and fails when the landfills active life is over we/our community still bears this risk of contaminants that remain. This is not a legacy we want to leave for our children.

- Odours:
 - I'd just like to highlight councils use of complaints received to it seems ring-fence the extent of the odour problem at their existing landfill at green island.
 - You can smell the landfill at Waldronville, just because a complaint is not received does not mean the odour is not present.
 - I would submit if it is bad enough for someone to complain, in most cases it has got to the point of being unbearable.
 - Just because an odour is bearable does not make it pleasant or something anyone would invite over their back fence.
 - This will have a significant impact on the amenity value of the surrounding area and in particular, if the wind is blowing the wrong way to my family on big stone road.
 - The only way I feel that this could be adequately addressed is if there is a condition excluding all organic, household and other putrescible waste from this landfill.

- Fire Risk: I have read the evidence and listened to the oral submissions of both Anthony Dixon and Paul de Mar and would like to address the following points:
 - With respect to ember transfer I note the measures indicated in conditions to mitigate this risk by limiting the exposed tip face.
 - Fire and Emergency in conjunction with the major forestry operators/companies carry out risk plans around forest areas. These risk plans build in a 1km fire margin around major forests. To mitigate risk these plans require a permit to be sort from Fenz in conjunction with the neighbouring Forest owner so that risks can be mitigated where required. Although not completely analogous (accidental versus deliberate lighting) can the council answer whether FENZ or local forestry owners have been consulted with respect to this risk?
 - Further would the council be prepared to entertain a condition that, as Local Forestry Companies do, that they also shut down all operations on fire risk peak days to eliminate the risk of fire on those days identified as extreme fire conditions?
 - With Respect to Deep Seated Fires
 - I have attended these in my role as a fire fighter both at dumps and composting facilities
 - I agree with Paul de Mer from first-hand experience that these take a lot of water to extinguish, just getting the water to the seat of the fire can be problematic.
 - Like a peat fire they can burn underground for days unnoticed until there is some visible sign above ground. So while they move slow they can be well established before discovery.
 - In the evidence of Andrew Rumsby at Pargraph 74 of his Brief there are examples of this in the setting of other landfills around the country and those examples provide a demonstration of the difficulties involved with extinguishing these fires.
 - So whilst 400,000L of water may seem like a lot, and is likely enough when looking at small isolated surface fires, as Indicated by Paul de Mar in his evidence a lot of water will be required to quench a deeper seated fire. Potentially necessitating outside assistance.
 - This quantity of water in a deep seated fire where constant turning over and wetting of waste would be required could take a lot more, it may be enough for the initial day, but if the incident ran on for multiple days as is shown from other landfill fires around the country more water would be required.
 - This begs 2 questions:
 - Where would this be obtained from (most likely FENZ tankers)

- Where does all this water go? Once mixed with waste this would also be leachate. This could potentially be millions of litres of water – it does not appear in the application that the council has allowed for how to deal with this possibility.

Those are the main points in response I wanted to cover off – Any further Questions?