

## WAR120258 Martinborough Wastewater Treatment Plant – summary of submissions

Submitter number	Name	Support/ Neutral/ Oppose	Hearing	Summary of submission
1	Alan Styles	Support	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments made</li> </ul>
2	Mahaki Trustees Ltd and Hikunui Trustees Ltd	Oppose	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement of the water quality in the Ruamahanga should be a priority</li> <li>SWDC need to change to a land irrigation system now</li> <li>Concern over number of water courses which drain from Pain Farm to Mahaki Farm</li> <li>Concern with impact on the runoff and groundwater as a consequence of any irrigation</li> </ul>
3	Regional Public Health	Neutral	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports SWDC policy to progressively reduce discharges to water;</li> <li>recognises poor recreational water quality is one key environmental factors contributing to poor human health;</li> <li>Cultural health effects</li> <li>Supports concept of Integrated Catchment Management, Martinborough WWTP integral to wider catchment and discharge significant point source discharge;</li> <li>Supports proposed conditions for warning signage</li> <li>Does not oppose proposed timeframe however health risk associated with discharge should be reduced as soon as practicable and timeframes seen as a maximum</li> <li>Satisfied that set back distance from boundary is appropriate and likely to ensure aerosol do not cross boundaries to adjoining properties</li> <li>Recommends that consent conditions for discharge to land under stage 2A reflect that technologies and treated wastewater demand may alter over the ensuing 16 years</li> <li>Recommends provision for formal structured process to track and monitor progress toward implementation of staged upgrades</li> </ul>
4	Kahungunu Ki Wairarapa	Neutral	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[31707] The less than minor effects of discharge could change over consent term of 35 years</li> <li>[32044] supportive of discharging treated effluent to land</li> <li>have preference for other conditions and discharges</li> <li>[32045] as part of a preference for spray irrigation KKW understands the risk of discharging contaminants to air</li> <li>[33045] would like assurances that measures have been taken to minimise the effects</li> </ul>

## WAR120258 Martinborough Wastewater Treatment Plant – summary of submissions

Submitter number	Name	Support/ Neutral/ Oppose	Hearing	Summary of submission
				<p>of this permit, monitoring will be undertaken to understand effects, reporting can evaluate any breaches and remediation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seek a shorter term of 20 years</li> </ul>
5	Bernard Hudepohl	Oppose	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong objections to discharge permits</li> <li>• do not portray a very clean green attitude</li> <li>• will have a long and drastic effect to my properties value therefore discriminating [severely] against us</li> </ul>
6	Beverley Clark	Oppose	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose continued use of waterways as an effluent pond</li> <li>• Pain Estate is a valuable town asset, not suitable for human wastewater management</li> <li>• In-ground dripper system preferred over above-ground</li> <li>• look at supplying horticultural groups with treated wastewater as an alternative</li> </ul>
7	Wairarapa Water Users Society	Oppose	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support Whaitua as part of process of review of Regional Plan</li> <li>• believes there must be equity in application of rules and regulations between rural and urban community</li> <li>• does not support 35 year term</li> <li>• rural water users have a shorter term for their consents to allow for new rules after the plan becomes effective</li> </ul>
8	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Oppose	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all applicants to be treated with equity</li> <li>• the Ruamahanga Whaitua will set limits and will be applicable to these resource consents</li> <li>• Management plans should be considered by the hearing committee</li> <li>• question how a proposal can be developed if flows are unknown</li> <li>• the standards could fail for three months of the summer when the river is at low flows and this is unacceptable</li> <li>• Conditions at the 'near zone' not known now so how can conditions be developed</li> </ul>
9	Neville Fisher	Oppose	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose lifting average daily discharge rate, effectively increases potential river loading when all efforts should be to reduce</li> </ul>

## WAR120258 Martinborough Wastewater Treatment Plant – summary of submissions

Submitter number	Name	Support/ Neutral/ Oppose	Hearing	Summary of submission
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>lifting maximum daily discharge rate to allow increased discharge at higher river flows little to no improvement to final receiving environment of Lake Onoke and Wairarapa</li> <li>oppose consent period of 35 years</li> <li>consent periods to be aligned with each stage of development and on a tighter time frame</li> </ul>
10	Federated Farmers Of New Zealand	Conditional	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledge application forms part of SWDC long term district wide integrated asset management strategy</li> <li>appreciate concern for affordability and support intent to implement longer term programme of staged upgrades</li> <li>appreciate concern for certainty and 35 year term</li> <li>support short-term focus on achieving significant reduction</li> <li>Ruamahanga Whaitua is tasked with developing objectives and limits for the catchment, this application be considered in context of those catchment-specific objectives and limits</li> <li>Ruamahanga catchment community will be best served with integrated catchment objectives and integrated catchment solutions</li> <li>support continued operation of Martinborough WWTP under expired consent conditions</li> <li>Recommend this consent application be deferred pending development of Ruamahanga Whaitua Plan Change</li> </ul>
11	Wellington Fish & Game Council	Oppose	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ruamahanga River principal trout fishery in Wairarapa</li> <li>listed in GWRC Regional Freshwater Plan as regionally important amenity and recreation values, and as a waterbody with water quality identified as needing enhancement</li> <li>suffers from degraded water quality caused by point source discharges, allocated abstraction and extremely low flows during summer</li> <li>with the exception of E.Coli current proposal fails to improve quality of discharged wastewater and fails to meet treated sewage discharge quality standard imposed by</li> </ul>

## WAR120258 Martinborough Wastewater Treatment Plant – summary of submissions

Submitter number	Name	Support/ Neutral/ Oppose	Hearing	Summary of submission
				<p>the current consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• application inconsistent with purpose and principals RMA</li> </ul>
12	South Wairarapa Biodiversity Group	Neutral	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lake Onoke is highly vulnerable to activities that occur further up the catchment, the lake is a sink for contaminants discharged upstream and continues to be heavily impacted by human activities</li> <li>• receiving environment influenced by cumulative contribution of nutrients including MWWTP</li> <li>• support proposal to reduce discharge</li> <li>• support progressive removal of direct discharge to the river</li> <li>• should not be able to increase contaminant loading and maximum loads to be defined in conditions</li> <li>• should have conditions for compliance and monitoring</li> <li>• Management Plans are missing a statement to meet conditions</li> <li>• the AEE does not provide comprehensive analysis of cumulative effects of the proposed discharge on Lake Onoke, this assessment is necessary before determining the application;</li> <li>• given the Regional Plan review and Ruamahanga Whaitua process it is premature to lock in contaminant discharges for 35 years</li> <li>• a compulsory review of conditions at 10 and 20 years or a term of 15 years to enable contaminant load conditions to be adjusted</li> </ul>
13	Martinborough Business Association	Neutral	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appeal of Martinborough and Wairarapa is ability to enjoy the environment</li> <li>• best interests that community waste is managed so that it doesn't affect actual or perceived quality</li> <li>• access to and use of Ruamahanga River is important, main access is Waihenga Bridge which is already subject to contact recreation health warnings, MWWTP will contribute same effect down the river</li> <li>• the wine sector has been making significant effort to improve environmental performance</li> </ul>

## WAR120258 Martinborough Wastewater Treatment Plant – summary of submissions

Submitter number	Name	Support/ Neutral/ Oppose	Hearing	Summary of submission
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• request conditions that are prescriptive, clear and enforceable</li> <li>• support consent conditions requiring all monitoring results to be posted on website</li> </ul>
14	Colin and Nalini Baruch	Oppose	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• opposed because downwind of proposed discharge area; recent truck wash and irrigation based at Martinborough Transport already shown that the level of odour is high enough to be offensive</li> <li>• do not have access to town water supplies, concerned that higher levels of effluent combined with current farm effluent and new truck wash will put aquifer and water supply at risk from contamination, rendering water supply unusable</li> <li>• business relies on water from aquifer in preparation of food products, contaminated water places business at risk</li> <li>• any closure due to odour drift, water contamination or related issues will have significant negative impact on business</li> <li>• surprised that SWDC would consider developing the effluent disposal so close to growing residential developments</li> <li>• there is other farmland around Martinborough further from residential properties which has seen less residential development of the years</li> </ul>
15	Patrick Desbonnets	Oppose	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the smell from land application would be intolerable considering that the main wind is a north-wester</li> </ul>
16	Dawn Proctor	Oppose	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• object to the discharge of treated effluent</li> <li>• real potential for objectionable odour and the prevailing wind being north west</li> <li>• real potential for river and stream pollution</li> </ul>