

Location of Offensive Odour and Occupation Boundaries

29. As noted by Mr Schmuck in his statement, the offensive odour boundary and the occupational area boundary do not coincide. I queried the reasons for this with Mr Maxwell from the Council. His response indicated that it was an oversight, that there was no particular reason for it and that it seemed sensible for the seaward boundaries to be aligned to reduce confusion. Mr Johnson from Total Marine has produced plans to correct the error and is able to answer questions if required.

Conclusion

30. The applications before you today seek renewal of consents for discharge for activities on the reserve and in the CMA, early replacement of current coastal permits and new coastal permits for extensions to the current activities in the CMA.
31. There are no substantive matters arising out of the submissions.
32. The staff report confirms that the effects of the applications will be no more than minor and consistent with the objectives and policies of the relevant planning documents. It recommends the applications be granted with conditions which the applicant has accepted, albeit with a couple of suggested amendments. Further evidence has been provided by the applicant to satisfy the concerns of the Harbour Master.
33. I submit therefore that the applications may and should be granted, subject to the conditions as proposed and/or amended.



Colleen Prendergast
Counsel for the Applicant
17 May 2018