

We have viewed the waste management proposal which includes a Remote transfer station to be sited in Duncan Bay.

From the document we understand there will be multiple users but the residents will be paying for the facility by way of a targeted rate.

i.e. Duncan Bay/Penzance/ Tuna Bay residents, day trippers, boaties, fishermen

Why should we pay via the targeted rate when it can be used by others at no charge?

LOCATION;

the map accompanying the proposal has the proposed location in the same place as the original burn facility. The site was turned down for green waste disposal because it was in an Outstanding Natural Landscape. How can a waste transfer station be an allowable activity in the same place that a green waste disposal area was turned down for resource consent?

Granted the position of the transfer station has not been approved but to even suggest it when the DBRA were billed some \$34,000 for a hearing process to be told that green waste disposal is not an allowable activity in an ONL, the suggestion of a transfer station in the same location totally flies in our face.

Clearly the council staff who has furnished the proposal has no knowledge of the sounds area and in particular Policy 15 of the NZCPS Natural features and Natural landscapes which requires decision makers to "avoid adverse effects on natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the coastal environment". This is an environmental bottom line.

The Council's own rules set out a colour palette for the Marlborough Sounds by contrasting and detracting from the colours in the natural environment as they have the potential to impact on the visual qualities and natural characteristics of landscape areas. Surely 20 wheelie bins with coloured lids do not meet their own colour palette standards in this natural environment. The majority of properties will look down on them.

The proposer of a remote transfer station obviously did no research in both the area nor the need for such facility.

We do not need a rubbish/waste facility we need a green waste disposal facility. Rubbish disposal has not been a "problem" from back when the subdivision was populated.

SUBMISSION FORM

The submission form accompanying the proposal does not relate whatsoever to any new remote transfer station. How can we complete a Submission when there are no questions that we can answer apart from making comments.

COMMUNITY MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

There is a meeting planned for 22 November at Rai Valley. There has been no forethought whatsoever to the date of the meeting for the Sounds area given that the road between Nelson and Rai Valley is closed until 18 December and most of the residents at Duncan Bay live in Nelson. The detour will take 3 hours each way to get to Rai Valley.

The proposal says hearings will be held in December and January when people are focused on Xmas and the holiday period. Was this deliberate so that it would escape most people simply because of timing?

NEGATIVES OF A REMOTE TRANSFER STATION IN DUNCAN BAY

Visually - most of the houses will be looking down on it.

The area proposed is the windiest in the Bay and the bin lids have the potential to blow open leaving the rubbish exposed. So far this year there have been three floods at the proposed site which means the bins would have been floating or tipping over.

The residents association works hard to control vermin in the Bay - rats, mice, stoats, rabbits. Any rubbish facility can attract these pests and scavenging seabirds.

Smell especially fish waste is a concern as is inappropriate dumping of items other than what's intended.

On the basis that a waste transfer station is not a requirement in our area the site proposed has been proven by an independent commissioner that, due to the Councils own regulations showing that it is an ONL, resource consent will never be granted.

We respectfully ask that Duncan Bay be removed forthwith from the list of proposed Remote Transfer Stations. It would save our residents preparing individual submissions and travel costs to attend the community meeting and associated hearings.

We learnt from the green waste hearing that one submission representing a group bears no weight so it appears that to get anyone to listen is to get all members to individually make submissions to be heard at a subsequent hearing. The DBRA has sent the proposal to all their members for them to do just that. Many members have already written to the Association to voice their concerns and pressuring the Association to vehemently object.

The remote transfer station proposed for Duncan Bay, which we object to, is not wanted nor required and will save Council and ratepayers considerable expense by deleting it as a proposed site.

We support the closing of the coin facility at Rai Valley and replacing it with a remote transfer station available 24/7.

Bruce Higgs