

CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL
APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT
RC240065 – HELIOS OTA OP LP
48 RANFURLY – NASEBY ROAD, RANFURLY 9396

MINUTE 3 Amended Application

- [1] On 3 June 2025 we received an amended application submitted to Council by the applicant. We asked Council to advise us on the implications of this amendment in terms of processing the application and meeting statutory obligations. We asked Council to advise whether they could still meet the report timeframes directed in Minute 2.
- [2] On 5 June 2025 we received a memorandum from Adam Vincent, Council Planning Officer. The memorandum advised us that the applicant had amended the application to remove the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) from the proposed solar farm. Instead, the applicant proposes to use the space it would have taken as a utility/storage area associated with the proposed substation. An updated Landscape Planting and Maintenance Plan has been provided which builds on the landscape assessment from Boffa Miskell provided in the initial application. An amended Assessment of Environmental Effects has been requested of the applicant. Other aspects of the proposal, such as the areas to be developed, location and design of connections to the grid and construction management have remained the same.
- [3] Mr Vincent noted that the amended application generally reduces the scale of the proposal, and that he is satisfied that the amendments would not significantly change the nature, scale, character or intensity of the adverse effects of the proposal. He noted that the amendments were made to directly address concerns raised in submissions. Mr Vincent does not consider that the proposal has been amended in a way that would cause any party who did not submit on the notified application to want to submit on the amended application. He does not consider that the amendments create any scope issues that warrant re-notification of the application.
- [4] Mr Vincent advises that the applicant has confirmed in writing that they consider that the project can stand alone without the BESS.
- [5] Mr Vincent confirmed that he is still on track to provide his s42A report on the amended application (including peer reviews of key parts of the application) within the timeframes set out in Minute 2.
- [6] We accept Mr Vincent's advice and agree that the amendment reduces the scope of the application and to continue with our process as set out in Minute 2 does not prejudice any party.

Decision

- [7] For the reasons stated above and in Mr Vincent's Memorandum (attached) we accept the amended application for processing, and remind all parties of the directions set out in Minute 2.

- [8] Any correspondence regarding this Minute should be directed to Council's Hearing Administrator: Tarryn.Lines@codc.govt.nz

Dated this 6th day of June 2025.

Signed by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Louise Taylor', written in a cursive style.

Louise Taylor

Chair – on behalf of the Independent Hearing Panel

Memorandum

To: Commissioner Louise Taylor (Panel Chair for RC 240065)

From: Adam Vincent

Subject: RC240065 - Helios OTA Op LP, 48 Ranfurly-Naseby Road, 2828012800 –
Clarification on scope of amended application

Council has received an amended application for the above application to establish a grid scale solar farm at 48 Ranfurly-Naseby Road, Naseby. As the amended application was provided after the close of submissions, the panel must be satisfied that the amendments remain within the scope of the application as notified. If the changes mean the application is no longer within scope, this may necessitate re-notification of the application in order to allow any interested parties to either amend their submission, or to submit if they have not done so. As the panel is responsible for ensuring the application is processed in accordance with relevant law, Council requests that the panel make a determination on whether the amended application remains within scope and can continue to be assessed, or whether it is not within scope and must be re-lodged to start the assessment of the application fresh. This memorandum sets out Council's recommendation on this matter.

The application has been amended to remove the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) from the proposed solar farm. Instead, the applicant proposes to use the space it would have taken as a utility/storage area associated with the proposed substation. An updated Landscape Planting and Maintenance Plan has also been provided. This plan builds on landscape assessment from Boffa Miskell provided in support of the initial application. An amended Assessment of Environmental Effects has been requested of the applicant. Other aspects of the proposal, such as the area to be developed, location and design of connections to the grid and construction management have remained the same.

In this case, I consider that the amended application generally reduces the scale of the proposal. I am satisfied that the amendments would not significantly change the nature, scale, character or intensity of the adverse effects of the proposal. The amendments were made to directly address concerns raised in submissions. I do not consider that the proposal has been amended in a way that would cause any party who did not submit on the notified application to want to submit on the amended application. I do not consider that the amendments create any scope issues that warrant re-notification of the application.

The applicant has confirmed in writing that they consider that the project can stand alone without the BESS. Aside from the applicant's statement in this regard, Council has not sought other expertise to either accept or refute the feasibility or implications of the revised

application. Should the Panel be of the mind to obtain or explore further clarification on this matter, then this may need to be requested of the applicant.

Council is in the process of commissioning peer reviews of key parts of the application. Experts being engaged have been provided the amendment material provided by the applicant. Based on responses from experts about their timeframes, I am confident that they can undertake their reviews and I can prepare my s42A report on the amended application within the timeframes set out in Minute 2.

For the reasons provided above, I consider the application to be within scope, and can stand on its own merits. I recommend that the panel continue with the current timeframes for assessing the application. The amended information provided by the applicant should be circulated to the submitters as soon as reasonably practicable if the panel resolves to keep assessing the amended application.

Recommended by:



.....
Adam Vincent
Planning Officer - Consents

5 June 2025
Date