

To : The Chief Executive
Environment Southland
Private bag DX20175
Invercargill

SUBMISSION FORM

Submission on a Notified Application for a Resource Consent

I, Rodney Bruce Bell

Of: 17 Denton Street, Gore 9710

At: 027 2292191 email: rodbell1960@gmail.com

Wish to oppose the application of

Name: Gore District Council

Application Number: APP-20202268

Location: The intersection between Church and Huron Streets, on the east bank and Surrey Street on the West bank.

I oppose the granting of a Resource Consent as applied for by the Gore District Council (GDC) for the construction of a bridge to cross the Mataura River at the intersection between Church and Huron Streets, on the east bank and Surrey Street on the West bank.

My reasons for my submission are

a) Aesthetically, I believe, the design to be a blight on the environment to a far greater degree than the opinion of the two consultants employed by the GDC to prepare a Landscape and Visual Impact report. Though of a 'unique and special design' as requested by GDC in its tender document, the concept does not fit into the Rural Character of its proposed location. It may very well sit appropriately in the waterfront of Auckland, Wellington and even perhaps Christchurch and Dunedin but it has no aesthetic value for the proposed site.

b)(i) The visual panorama looking upstream on the Mataura River from any point from the Road bridge crossing the Mataura is currently that of wide-open flood plains, hills, trees, and snow topped mountains. This visual environment would be grossly maligned by the construction of the proposed bridge.

ii) A GDC report also states that 'mast, handrails and deck will breach the skyline at its proposed building site'. Where currently the skyline is broken only as nature intended, by mountains, and is a vista of natural beauty the proposed bridge would break and defile this landscape.

c)(i) Any lighting providing safety or ease of use for the bridge or its associated shared pathway would add to the lighting pollution already created by the Gore township. Properties close to the bridge will undoubtedly have their home environments impacted on by this additional lighting, especially that on the mast and bridge deck.

(ii) GDC has also failed in its requirements to provide a lighting plan for the bridge and associated shared pathways with the designer claiming 'lighting is outside of current scope' and that 'routing electrical services and installing lighting columns through the existing flood plain would be extremely challenging (likely to cause issue with our resource consent). The designer went on to say if lighting is deemed to be needed in the future, lighting other than bridge lighting could be installed if/when needed. My belief is that lighting is required for the bridge and associated shared pathways at the time of construction. It was stated in this same report by a Safety Engineer that a 'bridge of this significance should have lighting to promote safety and use when dark'.

d)The potential for noise pollution in the environment is a distinct possibility, and probability, from the highly tensioned wire supports for the proposed bridge. It is my belief that it is inevitable that these wires will 'sing' in the wind. The level, tone, pitch, and overall resonance could likely be quite horrific and intrusive.

e) It is my belief that the proposed construction does not provide an inclusive environment for use by all community members. There is no allowance in the submitted application for use by blind or sight impaired persons. Nor is there consideration given in submitted plans for gradients on approaches to the bridge to be suitable for wheelchair users. Little has been offered to assist younger, novice or older cyclist, persons with pushchairs or similar or children on scoot bikes to negotiate the approaches to the bridge. An allowable recommended gradient of 6.5% is exceeded by the proposed plan to be 8% over 70metres. Councils response is to suggest using two, 9% 34m long gradients with a 2000m rest space between. I feel this does make the proposed environment fully inclusive for all community members.

f) Application for Resource Consent (PART A) required by Environment Southland as part of their Resource Consent Application process, includes section 8 requiring Affected Parties Please attach written approval from parties who may be affected by your activity. Written Approval of an Affected Party forms are available on the Environment Southland website. During the processing of your application, Council may determine that additional approvals are required. GDC has failed to meet this requirement on fronts: failure to consult directly affected persons, provide written summary of consultation and to obtain written consent for the proposed activity

I wish the Council to make the following decision that because,

- a) of the reasons detailed and
- b) the fact that many aspects of the Councils Design Plan have not yet been finalised and
- c) that the Council have failed to meet the requirements of their Resource Application to consult with directly affected parties and
- d) to provide a written report of this consultation and
- e) to obtain written consent from directly affected parties for the proposed project

Environment Southland decline the application for a Resource Consent applied for and that the GDC be asked to fully investigate all environmental aspects of their proposed bridge, provide all reports and documentation as required for the Resource Consent application and to provide details of alternative means and locations for providing piping resources to link East Gore with Jacobstown and Hilbre Avenue reservoir

I am not a trade competitor of the applicant (for the purposes of Section 308B of the resource Management Act 1991)

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission.

I do wish to be involved in any pre-hearing meeting that may be held for this application.

I have served a copy of my submission on the applicant. YES

Signed: electronically; R B Bell