

Submissions regarding the proposal by the MDC to set up a Remote Transfer Station at Duncan Bay

Introduction

- 1 My name is Richard Smedley.
- 2 I have been holidaying in Duncan Bay (**Bay**) for more than 16 Years and have owned a holiday home in the Bay with my wife Alexandra, situated at 21 Rata Street, since 2014.
- 3 I attended the hearing and acted as the spokesperson of the Duncan Bay (**Bay**) Residents Association in its recent unsuccessful application (**Application**) for resource consent (**No U200434**) to collect, stockpile and burn green waste on land¹ belonging to Scott Archer situated in the Bay.
- 4 I am currently the Vice Commodore of the Tennyson Inlet Boat Club.
- 5 My wife and I are opposed to the proposal (**Proposal**) by the Marlborough District Council (**MDC**) to set up a Remote Transfer Station (**RTS**) in the Bay to collect recyclable rubbish because:
 - a. it is unnecessary;
 - b. inconsistent with the finding of Commissioner Besier in U200434 that the adverse effect of stockpiling green waste in the Bay could not be disregarded;
 - c. will detract from the Outstanding Natural Landscape (**ONL**) within which the Bay is situated; and
 - d. ignores the needs of the Bay residents as regards rubbish² disposal.
- 6 It is understood that the Proposal only relates to the transferring of recyclable material (**Recyclables**) to a base depot.

The Proposal is unnecessary

- 7 In all the time we have holidayed in the Bay, we have separated, collected and transported Recyclables from the Bay to transfer stations located in Rai Valley, Nelson, Blenheim and sometimes Christchurch where we live and work.
8. We understand that other residents in the bay dispose of their Recyclables in the same way.
- 9 The quantity of Recyclables is never significant and easy to dispose of. The task is not onerous and is usually incorporated with other tasks such as grocery shopping. Accordingly, no identifiable carbon foot print is created when Recyclables are transferred to base depots in this way.
- 10 On the other hand, the Proposal will create a carbon footprint that did not previously exist.

¹ Lot 12 (**Lot12**) DP 333319 included as part of identifier 375967.

² By "rubbish" I include general waste, recyclable material and green waste.

The Proposal is inconsistent with the classification of the area as an ONL

- 11 It is understood that the Proposal includes that the RTS could and would be used by others who do not reside in the Bay including day visitors, persons using the launching facilities in the Bay, Harvey Bay Campers and other property owners in Pelorus Sound.
- 12 Anyone visiting the area including the Bay should be encouraged/required to take all their rubbish with them.
- 13 Providing an RTS within the Bay would encourage visitors to the Bay to leave their Recyclables in the Bay rather than taking it with them.
- 15 Providing an RTS within the Bay is likely to be abused by some visitors to dispose of other waste.
- 16 The proposed RTS would be an eyesore that could not be incorporated to the ONL.
- 17 The proposed RTS is likely to attract scavenging animals and birdlife.

The proposal ignores the actual needs of the Duncan Bay Residents

- 18 Application U200434, submissions made for and against it, the subsequent hearing and the final decision highlighted that the real need of the residents in the Bay, with respect to waste is the disposal of large quantities of green waste originating from private and MDC land.
- 19 The Proposal which is unnecessary does nothing to address the need to dispose of green waste.
- 20 Any money spent on implementing the Proposal would therefore be wasted.
- 21 It is submitted that that money would be better spent assisting the Bay residents to transfer their green waste, which until The Decision could be burnt on a community burn pile, to Base Depots.

R G Smedley